

the leasing of coal lands in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes, and to disagree to the Senate amendments and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Alaska coal bill (H. R. 14233) and ask for a conference. The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection, and the Speaker appointed as conferees on the part of the House Mr. FERRIS, Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois, and Mr. LENROOT.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. JONES, Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Tuesday, September 29, 1914, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. ADAMSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 2616) to promote the efficiency of the Public Health Service, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1171), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BULKLEY, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, to which was referred the bill (S. 6398) to amend section 1 of an act approved May 30, 1908, entitled "An act to amend the national banking laws," reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1173), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FINLEY: A bill (H. R. 19004) providing for the issue of emergency currency to aid in and facilitate the marketing of the cotton crop for the year 1914, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RUPLEY: A bill (H. R. 19005) for the purchase of a site and erection thereon of a public building at Millersburg, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19006) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Annville, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19007) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 19008) to authorize and direct the payment of pensions monthly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOWDLE: A bill (H. R. 19009) declaring it to be unlawful for any person, firm, copartnership, stock company, corporation, or association of any kind to construct or contract to construct within the United States or territorial jurisdiction any war vessel or guns or military equipment of such vessel for any foreign nation, and providing penalties for violation thereof; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRUMBAUGH: A bill (H. R. 19010) granting an increase of pension to John Hobensack; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DONOHUE: A bill (H. R. 19011) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Whalon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REILLY of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 19012) granting an increase of pension to Julia Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Maryland: A bill (H. R. 19013) for the relief of George Berry Dobyns; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas: A bill (H. R. 19014) granting an increase of pension to Catherine E. Wooldridge; to the Committee on Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petitions of business men of West Salem, Doylestown, Orville, and Dalton, all in the State of Ohio, in favor of House bill 5308; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, evidence to accompany House bill 18949, granting an increase of pension to Jacob A. Thuma; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BAILEY: Petition of Branch Patton (Pa.) Socialist Party, protesting against exportation of any foodstuffs to any nation at war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BATHRICK: Petition of the Schuster Co., of Cleveland, Ohio, protesting against tax on dry wines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of bankers in nineteenth Ohio congressional district, protesting against tax on capital stock and surplus; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Akron, Ohio, protesting against merchant-marine law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of Great Northern Life Insurance Co., Wausau, Wis., against war tax on life insurance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of sundry citizens of Sparta, Wis., relative to investigation of cucumber diseases; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FESS: Petition of Ohio Woman's Christian Temperance Union, protesting against tax on liquors; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARDNER: Petition of the Men's Bible Class of Market Street Baptist Church, of Amesbury, Mass., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petitions relating to proposed new taxation legislation signed by A. T. Lange, A. E. Webber, Francis H. Rogers, A. J. Orem, Frank Curtis, Irvin W. Masters, E. E. Brazier, and T. A. Frissell; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HART: Petition of citizens of New Jersey, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. REILLY of Connecticut: Memorial of the National Association of Vicksburg Veterans, favoring appropriation by Congress for reunion of veterans at Vicksburg, Miss.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. UNDERHILL: Petition of Philadelphia Board of Trade, protesting against passage of House bill 18666, providing for the ownership, etc., of vessels in the foreign trade; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WILLIAMS: Petition of 99 citizens of Oregon, Ill., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition of Twenty-fifth Ward Branch Socialist Party, of Chicago, favoring administration by the Government of food supply of the country; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

#### SENATE.

TUESDAY, September 29, 1914.

(Legislative day of Monday, September 28, 1914.)

The Senate reassembled at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

#### EMERGENCY REVENUE LEGISLATION.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication, which will be read and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The communication was read and referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

[Telegram.]

ANTIGO, Wis., September 28, 1914.

Hon. THOMAS R. MARSHALL,

Vice President of the United States, Washington, D. C.:

On behalf of 5,000 members of the Wisconsin Woman's Christian Temperance Union we respectfully urge that the emergency internal-revenue tax shall be levied that we as patriotic citizens may help bear this national burden, and for other cogent reasons we earnestly protest against raising any part of this emergency revenue from a tax on alcoholic liquors.

MRS. W. A. LAWSON, President.

Mr. JONES. I have here a telegram from the Baker Boyer National Bank, the First National Bank, the Farmers' Savings Bank, the Third National Bank, and the People's State Bank, all of Walla Walla, Wash., protesting against the injustice of levying a tax of \$2 a thousand on capital, surplus, and undivided

profits of banks. I ask that it may be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be so referred.

Mr. STONE. I have a clipping which I took from the Chicago Tribune—I was about to say on Sunday, but it may have been Saturday—containing an interview with Mr. Copley, Republican Member of the House of Representatives from the State of Illinois, giving reasons why he had voted for the bill which just passed the House providing for additional revenue. I should like to have it read. It is short.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Mr. Copley voted for it because he believed its passage absolutely necessary to the well-being of the country.

The Republicans turned their attacks on the war tax to a defense of the "iniquitous Payne-Aldrich" tariff law as a revenue producer. They declared that the Underwood-Simmons tariff law is a failure as a revenue getter, and that had the Democrats listened to them and left the Payne-Aldrich law on the statutes there would be no necessity for a war tax now.

Mr. Copley answered this argument tersely. "I am a protectionist," he said, "from the bottom of my feet to the top of my head, but there has never been in the history of this House or any other a tariff law which would produce enough revenue to meet the needs of a nation as large as the United States during a war as comprehensive as the present one in Europe."

CALLS IT "GOOD BUSINESS."

While I do not agree with all features of the bill, on the whole it is a good one. It can be and probably will be improved by the Senate. But if it should fail to pass there, I know from my own experience in business that within three months there will be need for this country to increase its revenues. It is better to provide for that need now than to wait until it is pressing. Delay would only mean a more drastic measure. More than that, delay would be exceedingly bad government business. The passage of this bill to-day is nothing more nor less than good business.

LABOR CONDITIONS IN COLORADO.

Mr. SMOOT. In behalf of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CATRON] I present one or two letters which he desired to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DENVER, COLO., September 12, 1914.

Hon. T. B. CATRON,  
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Pursuant to your suggestion, I inclose correspondence disclosing the facts relative to one instance of what, to me, appears an unjust interference by the Federal troops with our right to employ men and the correlative right of men to work if they so desire.

Yours, truly,

W. J. MURRAY.

DENVER, September 10, 1914.

Maj. D. C. CABELL,  
Commanding United States Troops, Ludlow, Colo.

DEAR SIR: A few days ago, probably late in August, a man by the name of Guadalupe Gusman, applied for and was given work at our mine at Delagua. He came to us wholly of his own volition, without solicitation upon our part. He was subsequently compelled by men under your command to give up his job. Will you not be kind enough to advise me of the circumstances surrounding this case?

Yours, truly,

W. J. MURRAY.

HEADQUARTERS UNITED STATES TROOPS,  
Trinidad, Colo., August 28, 1914.

Subject: Conditions under which labor may be employed in the coal mines.

To all station commanders:

1. Pursuant to instructions of the Secretary of War, dated August 26, 1914, the following is published for the direction and guidance of all concerned:

To secure uniformity the orders heretofore issued will be carried out hereafter in the following particulars and dealt with thus: With respect to those mines which are running—

First. Operators are not permitted to gather men and ship them in to such mines.

Second. Miners who apply at mines may be there employed, provided, (a) they are residents of the State of Colorado; (b) and have complied with the laws of Colorado relating to miners.

2. The coal-mining laws of the State of Colorado referred to in (b) above provide: (a) No males under 16 years of age and no females can be employed in or about coal mines or coke ovens except in clerical capacity. (b) From and after January 1, 1914, it shall be unlawful for any owner of any mine to employ coal examiner, shot firer, mine foreman, assistant mine foreman, or fire boss who does not possess a certificate from the board of examiners, except as herein provided.

3. Request has been made of the Secretary of War for a ruling as to who is a "resident of the State of Colorado" for the purpose of this order. Until receipt of such ruling a "resident of the State of Colorado" is defined to be a person actually residing in the State on this date, August 28, 1914.

By order of Col. Lockett:

V. JAS. ROCKWELL,  
Captain and Adjutant, Eleventh Cavalry, Adjutant,  
LUDLOW, COLO., September 11, 1914.

To Mr. W. J. MURRAY,  
Vice President and General Manager,  
Victor-American Fuel Co., Denver, Colo.:

1. Returned. The examination of this man developed that he came of his own will without solicitation. He came into this State from

Kansas after August 28, 1914, and for this reason was prevented from working in the mines, in accordance with instructions contained in letter from Headquarters United States Troops, August 28, 1914, copy inclosed.

D. R. C. CABELL,  
Major, Eleventh Cavalry,  
Commanding United States Troops, Ludlow, Colo.

PROPOSED ANTITRUST LEGISLATION.

Mr. CULBERSON. I ask for the regular order, Mr. President.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the conference report on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses upon the bill (H. R. 15657) to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes.

Mr. SMOOT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered the roll call. There is not a quorum present. The

Ashurst	Kern	Pomerene	Smoot
Bryan	Lea, Tenn.	Reed	Thompson
Chamberlain	Martin, Va.	Shafroth	Thornton
Chilton	Martine, N. J.	Sheppard	Townsend
Culbertson	Myers	Shively	Weeks
Gore	Nelson	Simmons	West
Hughes	O'Gorman	Smith, Ariz.	Williams
Johnson	Overman	Smith, Ga.	
Jones	Perkins	Smith, S. C.	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Thirty-four Senators have answered the roll call. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the roll of absentees.

The Secretary called the names of absent Senators, and Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. PAGE, Mr. PITTMAN, Mr. RANSDELL, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. STERLING, Mr. VARDAMAN, and Mr. WHITE answered to their names when called.

Mr. PAGE. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. DILLINGHAM], and to state that he is paired with the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH]. I should like to have this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I was requested to state for the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CAMDEN] that he is necessarily absent on account of illness in his family.

Mr. McCUMBER entered the Chamber and answered to his name.

Mr. McCUMBER. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. GRONNA]. He will be absent during the entire week, and I make this statement now for the week.

Mr. LANE entered the Chamber and answered to his name.

Mr. SMOOT. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. SUTHERLAND] is necessarily absent, and that he is paired with the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE].

I wish also to announce that the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] is absent by leave of the Senate and is paired with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN].

I desire also to announce that the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] is unavoidably absent, and that he is paired with the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN].

Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. NORRIS, Mr. WALSH, Mr. COLT, and Mr. STONE entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Forty-nine Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask to have read as a part of my remarks the following telegram.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

ST. LOUIS, MO., September 28, 1914.

Hon. JAMES A. REED,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The shoe-manufacturing industry is one among the few great industries in this country in which no form of trust has ever existed. The shoe manufacturer, however, is surrounded by trusts and is absolutely dominated by the Shoe Machinery Trust. Since its methods have destroyed all competition in shoe machinery, no more grasping or domineering trust ever existed. The great work you have done to curb the Shoe Machinery Trust is very gratefully appreciated. Can you not get the criminal provision as provided in the Senate bill restored? It is very important that this be done.

INTERNATIONAL SHOE CO.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask to have read a telegram from Hon. John C. Roberts, who is proprietor of the St. Louis Star, a man who has been for many years a very successful business man and manufacturer, and who also is one of the best Democrats in the United States and an original Wilson man.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read.



The Secretary read as follows:

ST. LOUIS, Mo., September 28, 1914.

HON. JAMES A. REED,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Your stand in the Clayton bill is most gratifying. I trust you will put the teeth back into it and fight to a finish. It seems the Democrats have forgotten their Baltimore platform pledge.

JOHN C. ROBERTS.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I ask to have printed in the RECORD a telegram from the Vicksburg Clearing House Association and one from the secretary of the Mississippi Bankers' Association and that they be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the telegrams presented by the Senator from Mississippi will be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The telegrams are as follows:

VICKSBURG, MISS., September 28, 1914.

HON. JAMES K. VARDAMAN,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

We strongly urge you to oppose amendment of Clayton bill in such manner as to prohibit interlocking directorates, and particularly interlocking directorates of banks in smaller communities. Such legislation at this time would accentuate the unsettled conditions now existing and render more difficult than ever the return to normal conditions.

VICKSBURG CLEARING HOUSE ASSOCIATION.

VICKSBURG, MISS., September 28, 1914.

Senator JAMES K. VARDAMAN,  
Washington, D. C.:

Tax imposed on banks by Underwood bill appears unjust and discriminatory. Banks are willing to pay their proper share, but urge that Underwood bill be modified so as to distribute tax more equitably, by assessing other classes of corporations. Would appreciate your efforts toward this end.

T. H. DICKSON,  
Secretary Mississippi Bankers' Association.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I have here an article printed in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of September 10, 1914, which contains an analysis of the bill now under consideration. Although the article does not bear directly upon the conference report, because it antedates that report, it is nevertheless pertinent. After digesting the bill the writer has some comments to make upon it, and I ask that that part of the article under the subtitle "Some serious flaws" be read from the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

#### SOME SERIOUS FLAWS.

The foregoing digest is made from the House bill as amended by the Senate, passed, and sent to conference. It is the substance of the bill as it stands to-day. Needless to say, it should be further amended, and presumably will have to be, if it is to receive the approval of President Wilson.

Because, in its present form, while it improves the position of the wage earner, the trust victim suing for redress, the corporation stockholder, and the Government, it falls far short of fulfilling either the Democratic Party's platform pledge or the country's need.

Whose crime is meaner, more infamous, than that of the forestaller and monopolist of life's necessities, inflicting the misery of want upon a multitude of people?

Shall such a man, or group of men, being convicted, be found guilty, as this bill proposes, of nothing more serious than a misdemeanor? Shall the new law limit the possible punishment of such men to a "fine not exceeding \$5,000, or by imprisonment for not exceeding one year, or by both, in the discretion of the court"—a punishment which the court may, if he so please, fix at a fine of 1 cent, or of one minute in jail, or both?

Shall the officer or director of a railroad, having looted or permitted the looting of millions from his stockholders, be permitted, as this bill proposes, to escape with a possible fine of \$500 or a minimum of a year in jail, at the court's discretion?

If guilt is to be "made personal" in this field, ought not its punishment to bear some nearer relation to the quantity and quality of the crime? Would it not be ridiculous expressly to limit that punishment, in the law, to a fine which the offender could pay without missing it, and which he can, as he so often has done, promptly collect from the people by raising the price of his goods?

Could Standard Oil ask for anything better than that paragraph of section 6 which authorizes the formation of subsidiary corporations to carry on its business in the several portions of the country? This is, indeed, precisely the device which Standard has long employed to operate in States from which it has been banished for law-breaking, and to keep up the false appearance of competition where in fact no competition existed.

Why exempt railroads from the prohibition of interlocking directors when it is notorious that this abuse has borne its worst fruits in railroad management?

Why is the bill silent on the subject of stock watering, among the gravest of corporate evils, which has defrauded investors out of millions upon millions of dollars and bred grave conflicts between corporate managers trying to pay dividends on the water and their employees demanding higher wages?

If it be desirable, as the Democratic Party declared in its platform, to "restore to the statute the strength of which it has been deprived (by the Supreme Court's "rule of reason" decision), why does not this bill specifically so declare? Is the Congress incapable of writing

a law whose meaning shall be so clear that the Federal courts can not mistake it?

Far more than the fate of the Democratic Party is bound up in this proposed legislation. It is to cure old evils, prevent new abuses, and provide a foundation upon which America's commerce may go forward during a long period of years without further regulative interruption. Is it not, then, vital to give the bill in its formative period the sharpest scrutiny, the most searching criticism, lest it emerge as a betrayal of the dominant party's pledges, a profound disappointment of the country's deep desire?

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. REED. I do.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, I raise the point of order that there has been no intervening business since the absence of a quorum was last suggested.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That has heretofore been the ruling of the Chair. No business has been transacted.

Mr. NORRIS. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN] presented two telegrams and asked unanimous consent to have them printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Finance. That was done. I do not see any reason why that is not business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair was in error as to what had taken place. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Lane	Page	Sterling
Bryan	Lea, Tenn.	Perkins	Swanson
Chamberlain	McCumber	Pittman	Thompson
Chilton	Martin, Va.	Pomerene	Thornton
Colt	Martine, N. J.	Reed	Townsend
Crawford	Nelson	Sheppard	Walsh
Culberson	Norris	Shively	Weeks
Fletcher	O'Gorman	Smith, Ariz.	West
Hitchcock	Overman	Smoot	White

The VICE PRESIDENT. Thirty-six Senators have answered to the roll call. There is not a quorum present.

Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. GORE, and Mr. MYERS entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Forty-one Senators have answered to their names. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the roll of the absentees.

The Secretary called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. McLEAN, Mr. SHAFROTH, and Mr. WARREN answered to their names when called.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I desire to announce that the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] is paired on all votes with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]. This announcement may stand for the day.

I also desire to announce that the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] is temporarily absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Forty-four Senators have answered to the roll call. There is not a quorum present.

Mr. OVERMAN. I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from North Carolina.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

Mr. KERN, Mr. VARDAMAN, Mr. RANDELL, Mr. JOHNSON, and Mr. BANKHEAD entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Forty-nine Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, when the hour of recess arrived last evening I was discussing section 3 of the conference report, which prohibits tying contracts, and had undertaken to show that the conferees, by adding an amendment to the original House provision first taking out the criminal penalties and then adding the qualifying clause, "where the effect of such lease, sale, or contract for sale or such condition, agreement, or understanding may be to substantially lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce," have so weakened the bill as practically to destroy its remedial effect.

I desire, before passing from this section, to make one additional observation.

The section as passed by the Senate contained this language:

That it shall not be lawful to insert or incorporate a condition in any contract relating to the sale or lease of or license to use any article or process protected by a patent or patents.

The words "or license to use" are of great import, because they exactly describe the practice now in vogue by the great monopolies that are employing this particular tying device for

the purpose of extending their monopolistic control. The method is to attach to a machine which is patented a simple license stipulation providing somewhat as follows:

This machine is licensed upon the express understanding that the holder thereof shall use upon it only products which are manufactured by the lessor—

Or "the seller," as the case may be. Now, the term "or license" is left out of the bill as it comes to us from conference. Hence it is very probable that the particular practice I have referred to is not inhibited by the bill as it now stands.

The bill as we passed it covered the "licensing or selling of any article or process upon condition that the purchaser shall not purchase goods from another than the seller," and so forth. Now, it so happens that there are certain patented processes the right to use which is granted by sale, license, or lease, the article itself not being sold, licensed, or leased. The striking out of the words "or process" leaves the bill so that it does not embrace tying conditions in contracts relating to processes. I simply call attention to these two matters in passing.

I might as well now as elsewhere discuss an important change which has been made by inserting, in section 4, the word "substantially." In this section you will find that the conferees have not provided that a tying contract shall be void in itself because it is against public policy, but it is to be void only when the making of the contract shall result in substantially lessening competition. In section 7 of the bill, which limits the acquisition of the stock of one corporation by another corporation, the Senate prohibition covered stock ownership where the effect of the acquisition might be to lessen competition. In the conferees' report, however, we find that phrase changed to "may be to substantially lessen competition"; and further on in the same section some three different times the word "substantially" is written in to qualify the phrase as it existed when the bill left the Senate.

This leads me to offer some observations upon the word "substantially."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. REED. I do.

Mr. WALSH. Before the Senator proceeds to do so, it might be well to remark that the word "substantially" was in the bill when it came from the House; that the bill received very careful consideration from the Judiciary Committee, of which the distinguished Senator from Missouri was a member; that the committee was not moved to take out the word, but that it was taken out in the Senate, and simply restored by the conferees as it was passed in the House and approved by the Senate Judiciary Committee.

Mr. REED. Yes; but I presume the action of the Senate in taking out the word "substantially," notwithstanding the fact that the Senate committee had allowed it to remain in, gives added force to what I am saying, because manifestly it is a much graver thing for the conferees to recede from an action taken by the Senate, after solemn debate and upon vote, than it is to recede from a proposition that was merely reported by a committee and accepted as a matter of course by the Senate.

Mr. WALSH. I referred to the fact because I thought it might fairly be inferred, as I think is the case, that the Judiciary Committee was not impressed with the difference between "lessening competition" and "substantially lessening competition" sufficiently even to excite discussion upon the subject.

Mr. REED. Well, Mr. President, whether the Judiciary Committee was or not, the Senate was; and the Senate, after full debate, struck out the word "substantially."

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. REED. I do.

Mr. OVERMAN. Does the Senator mean to say that in all cases the conferees on the part of the Senate should insist and insist and stand all the time for what the Senate did? If that were true, could there ever be an agreement in conference?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I have not made any such insistence, and no one is warranted in drawing such a deduction from what I have said.

Mr. OVERMAN. Well, the Senator has been criticizing—

Mr. REED. In commenting upon this bill as it is now before us as the result of the conferees' work, however, it is entirely proper for me to challenge the thought of the Senate to the fact that the bill as now presented is an unsound measure. Such comment need not be regarded as a reflection upon anybody or any criticism of anybody.

Mr. OVERMAN. I did not take it as a criticism, but I am taking it as a principle and as a matter of procedure. How in the world, because the Senate has put on an amendment, can it be said that we have got to continue to insist and insist and never agree? If we did that, we never would have any bill at all. Where there was a difference between the House and the Senate, we never would have any legislation. These matters are matters of compromise, and all legislation is a matter of compromise, or you will have no legislation.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the question we are considering now, or that we will consider before this controversy is over, is whether this bill will be recommitted with instructions; and as pertinent to that issue I propose to discuss every defect in this bill to the best of my ability and to discuss them as long as I shall feel like proceeding with the discussion.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I am not criticizing the Senator. He is proceeding within his rights. He has a right to do this; but when he criticizes the conferees for yielding I want to know how we can ever agree to any bill without concessions on each side.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I have not mentioned this morning the fact that the conferees yielded or did not yield. My friend evidently did not sleep well last night or got out of the wrong side of bed this morning, and got out wrong end to. I have not said anything to-day about the conferees yielding.

Mr. OVERMAN. The Senator got up wrong about a month ago. He has been criticizing and continuing to criticize for weeks.

Mr. REED. I know that any man is wrong who criticizes the sacred action of the conferees. I know that there is a sentiment in the Senate, pretty generally disseminated, that if a man can get on a conference committee he can there write a bill to suit himself.

Mr. OVERMAN. The Senator has never been on a conference committee, so far as I know.

Mr. REED. Yes; I have been on a conference committee.

Mr. OVERMAN. Probably when he does he will see that you have to agree with the other parties before you can have any legislation.

Mr. REED. I fully understand the duties of a conferee. When I have been here as long as the Senator from North Carolina has and have gained that wisdom which comes with the ripeness of age and great experience I may fall into the idea that when I am a conferee I have the right to do as I please. Just at present, however, being a mere tenderfoot and greenhorn who has blundered into this august body, and being almost completely overwhelmed by the intellectual superiority of my associates, I venture occasionally to entertain the old-fashioned notion that the Senate of the United States is bigger than the conferees of any committee. Further, I desire to say this in all kindness, for the love I bear my good friend passeth all understanding, which he very well knows—also, I profoundly respect him and do most ardently admire him—that I am making no personal fight here. I make contention because I believe this bill is a betrayal of the Democratic Party and of the country. I do not care how innocent that betrayal may be; I do not care how much of good faith may have gone along with it; as I view this legislation it is an absolute turning around, a facing about, by our party. We march now to the rear where we promised the country an advance to the front. The proposition no longer is to proceed by penalties, no longer is to suppress by the fear of fine and imprisonment. For these methods we now propose to substitute a sort of regulation. Whereas formerly the penalties of the law hung like the sword of Damocles above the head of every man who, in willful violation of the law, sought to levy unjust tribute upon the country, we now propose to adopt a new method and to turn him over to the tender care of a commission that can not punish him by a single day in jail, the levy of a fine or imposition of any penalty whatsoever, and I shall continue to protest, sir, even though complaisant acquiescence might be for the moment more popular.

Mr. President, I am entirely willing to yield to any Senator at any time for a question, but hereafter when a Senator feels the spirit moving him so that he wants to make a speech or to express his spleen or to lecture me I trust he will restrain himself until he can relieve his feelings in his own time. These acrimonious interruptions are discords in melodies I am now producing and entirely destroy their soothing effects.

I was about to offer some observations on the word "substantially." It either has a meaning in this bill or it does not have a meaning. If it has no meaning, it should not be in the bill. If it does have a meaning, then it is important to ascertain to what extent it qualifies the language in connection with which it is used.



When we come to examine the word "substantially" in section 7 in its context we find it thus appears:

That no corporation engaged in commerce shall acquire, directly or indirectly, the whole or any part of the stock or other share capital of another corporation engaged also in commerce where the effect of such acquisition may be to lessen competition.

So said the Senate bill, but now we find it is made to read:

May be to substantially lessen competition.

Now, what does "substantially" mean as thus used? It has a meaning or it would not have been inserted by the conferees. Plainly it was intended to say that it is not enough that the stock owned by a corporation may lessen, but it must do more; it must substantially lessen competition.

Further on in the bill, in the clause relating to holding companies, as the bill is now drawn, the word "substantially" again appears, so that as to holding companies the fact that a corporation owns the stock of two or more corporations and that the effect may be to lessen competition is not sufficient to warrant the bringing of an action, the lessening must be substantial.

Further on in the bill the word "substantially" twice again appears. I will not stop to comment upon the context in these two latter cases, because I have said enough to lay the foundation for the observations I desire to make.

I regard it, Mr. President, as a general principle that when a law, general in its terms, is amended by singling out specific acts or practices which would otherwise be embraced within the general terms of the existing law these acts or practices thus singled out are thereafter to be governed by the provisions of the amendment. I believe it to be true that if a statute in general terms defines larceny and affixes a punishment, under such a statute a horse thief could be tried and the penalty of larceny inflicted. But if subsequently a law is passed dealing specifically with horse stealing and affixing a penalty, thereafter the horse thief would be tried under the latter statute and the penalty therein prescribed would be visited.

Applying the foregoing I have this to say: The Sherman Act denounced all agreements in restraint of trade and provided a penalty of fine and imprisonment. We now propose to enact a statute denouncing tying contracts and certain other practices which may be of such a character as to amount to a restraint of trade. Having thus singled out and specifically provided for this particular practice in restraint of trade, it is at least open to argument whether we have not thereby taken that particular practice from the purview of the Sherman Act itself.

If we fail in the present bill to reenact the same penalty provided in the Sherman Act, we are in danger of finding that we have removed the particular practice specified from the scope of the Sherman Act where it can now be penalized and place it under another law where no penalty follows.

THE INCORPORATION OF THE WORD "SUBSTANTIAL" IN THE BILL A MORE RADICAL CHANGE IN THE TRUST LAWS THAN THE INSERTION OF THE WORD "UNREASONABLE" BY THE SUPREME COURT.

We have changed the rule of the Sherman Act. The Sherman Act provided that all contracts in restraint of trade were illegal. The conferees, by their amendment, have interjected the word "substantial." It was enough under the Sherman Act to show that there was a restraint of trade. Under this section, treating of the same character of subjects embraced within the Sherman Act, we now provide that the restraint of trade—lessening of competition—must be "substantial." That is a very different thing from the rule of the Sherman Act. The change is radical, far-reaching, and is likely to be disastrous.

All will remember when the Supreme Court wrote the word "reasonable" into the Sherman Act. When that decision was announced it was recognized as being of a revolutionary character. It struck the country as being a deadly blow to trust litigation. Within a week's time some half dozen propositions to amend the Sherman statute so as to nullify the effect of the decision were introduced into the Senate. Now, however, by positive legislation, we propose to write into the act a vastly greater qualification than the Supreme Court injected into it.

The Supreme Court said that the restraint of trade must be "unreasonable." We say it must be "substantial." Unless the word "substantial" means as much as the word "unreasonable," it means nothing. In my opinion the word is of broader significance and the injury done to our trust legislation by its interpolation is greater than was accomplished by the Supreme Court when it manufactured and imported into the statutes of Congress the term "unreasonable."

Moreover, in the future, when the court comes to construe the trust act in a case against a trust and finds that one of the practices employed by the trust for the purpose of completing its monopoly is a tying contract, the court will naturally say that before it can hold such an act to be illegal it must find that

the tying contract substantially lessened competition, a thing very difficult to prove and entirely different from the requirements of the Sherman law, which are to the effect that if trade is at all restrained then the act is illegal.

It is my opinion that by accepting the amendment of the conferees we shall give legislative sanction to the process of whitening away the body of our trust legislation.

#### SECTION 2 WORTHLESS WITHOUT A PENAL PROVISION.

I now come to consider section 2, and without indulging in any language which may be regarded as violent or strong I declare it to be my opinion that section 2 as now written is absolutely silly, because it is absolutely without any practical force. That is pretty strong language, and yet I believe I can demonstrate it to be fully justified.

What is section 2? It is brought forward here as a remedy for the existing evil of local price cutting. The common practice indulged by very great and wealthy concerns is to go into a trade territory where there is competition and drop the price of an article below the cost of production. In a little while its competitors have been absolutely driven into bankruptcy or forced to quit the field. Thereupon the great concern proceeds to advance the price on that same community and recoup itself for all losses. In the meantime, without the ultimate loss of a penny, it has established a monopoly in that country, State, or neighborhood by driving out all competitors.

The evil is not a trifling one. The House in its report, which is adopted by the Senate committee, had this to say:

Section 2 of the bill is intended to prevent unfair discriminations. It is expressly designed with the view of correcting and forbidding a common and widespread unfair trade practice whereby certain great corporations, and also certain smaller concerns which seek to secure a monopoly in trade and commerce by aping the methods of the great corporations, have heretofore endeavored to destroy competition and render unprofitable the business of competitors by selling their goods, wares, and merchandise at a less price in the particular communities where their rivals are engaged in business than at other places throughout the country.

The violation of any of the provisions of this section is made a misdemeanor, and is made punishable by fine or imprisonment, or both.

Every concern that engages in this evil practice must of necessity recoup its losses in the particular communities or sections where their commodities are sold below cost or without a fair profit by raising the price of this same class of commodities above their fair market value in other sections or communities. Such a system or practice is so manifestly unfair and unjust, not only to competitors who are directly injured thereby, but to the general public, that your committee is strongly of the opinion that the present antitrust laws ought to be supplemented by making this particular form of discrimination a specific offense under the law when practiced by those engaged in commerce.

The committee then goes on to state that so great is this evil, and so widespread, that it has been made the subject of specific legislation in 19 different States, and adds:

In seeking to enact section 2 into law we are not dealing with an imaginary evil or against ancient practices long since abandoned, but are attempting to deal with a real, existing, widespread, unfair, and unjust trade practice that ought at once to be prohibited in so far as it is within the power of Congress to deal with the subject.

Mr. President, I ask to attach hereto as a part of my remarks, without reading, the list of States which have enacted laws denouncing local price cutting.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The list referred to is as follows:

1. Arkansas, act of 1905, as amended March 12, 1913.
2. Idaho, antitrust act of 1911.
3. Iowa, Revised Statutes.
4. Louisiana, act of 1908.
5. Missouri, Revised Statutes.
6. Nebraska, act of 1913.
7. New Jersey, act of 1913.
8. North Carolina, act of 1913.
9. Oklahoma, act of 1913.
10. South Carolina, act of 1902.
11. Utah, act of 1913.
12. Wisconsin, act of 1913.
13. Wyoming, Revised Statutes, 1911.
14. Kansas, act of 1905.
15. Michigan, act of 1913.
16. Massachusetts, act of 1912.
17. Montana, act of 1913.
18. North Dakota, act of 1913.
19. California, act of 1913.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, in every one of these States, so far as I know, the indulgence in this practice has been made a crime, and heavy penalties are laid against those who practice the evil. Among the States which have prohibited the practice is New Jersey, which covered it by the act of 1913. I again call attention to the language of the committee's report:

It is important that these State statutes be supplemented by additional legislation by Congress, for—

Says the report—

It is now possible for one of these great corporations doing business in not only the 48 States, but throughout the world, to lower the prices of its commodities in a particular State and sell within that State at a uniform price in compliance with State laws, and thereby destroy the

business of all independent concerns and competitors operating within the State.

Mr. President, if that report be true, then we are dealing with an evil of gigantic magnitude; we are confronted by a situation where trusts, combinations, and vast aggregations of capital are able to go into a sovereign State, reduce the price upon some necessity of life below its actual cost, destroy every competitor within that State, then take and hold the field alone. Having taken the territory, it has power to levy the monopolist's toll and extort not only the pound of flesh but the blood that flows from the gaping wound. If one-tenth of what is said in that report is true, then we have no right to trifle with this evil. When we propose to trifle with it we betray the party that sent us here instructed to eradicate these great wrongs.

Mr. President, I again assert that for all practical purposes section 2 might as well have been eliminated from this bill at the same moment of time that its criminal penalty was eliminated. Why do I say that? How long would it take to suppress horse stealing if the law provided that you must first catch the thief, then carry him before a commission, then prove him guilty, then give him the right of appeal to the courts, then give him the right to go to the appellate courts, and, at the end of all the years of litigation, all you could do with him were to command him not to steal any more horses, and allow him to ride away on the horse he had stolen?

How long would it take to suppress burglary if the law provided that you must catch your burglar, take him before a commission, and after the commission had examined into the facts, after the long course of years had run, and on appeal the finding of the commission had been sustained, all you could do with the burglar were to say to him, "Go, thou, and sin no more; but keep the swag you have already accumulated?"

But this provision is even worse than that illustration. Under this provision a monopoly or trust can enter a great State; it can, as says the committee of the House, absolutely proceed by a system of price cutting to drive out of business every man engaged in that particular line of trade in that State. In the meantime, by advancing prices elsewhere, it can recoup its losses. Having driven all of these men out of business, it now occupies the field and can collect the enormous profit monopoly always exacts. It can continue to collect these profits to the day of final judgment.

What is the remedy we propose by this bill. The concern can be taken before a commission; weeks and months will undoubtedly elapse before the commission shall have concluded its hearings. All the skill of the best corporation lawyers will be employed; every method of delay will be sought, every technicality will be raised. The time necessary to collect the evidence will necessarily be very considerable. Depositions may be taken perhaps from New York to San Francisco. At the end of all the hearings will come the argument of counsel. Then days and possibly weeks or months of deliberation by the commission.

In the meantime what? In the meantime the practice goes on; in the meantime the concern collects its monopolistic toll. In the meantime what further? In the meantime the competitor is being choked to death; his trade is being destroyed; bankruptcy is impending, maybe it has come. At last the commission renders its decision. Then, with the look of a saint and with the manner of a martyr, the attorney for the corporation appeals from the decision of the commission to the United States court of appeals. Again comes the consumption of time incident to the filing of the record, the briefs of counsel, the arguments before the court. After about two years have elapsed—and that is the shortest time in which you can hope to obtain a hearing even under the provisions of this bill—a decision is rendered. In the meantime what? In the meantime the monopolist has still been crowding, crowding, crowding his weaker competitor from the field of action. The United States court of appeals decides against the practice, whereupon a writ of error is immediately sued out and the case is carried before the Supreme Court of the United States. Again come the counsel with their briefs and green bags. Again, after months, perhaps years, of delay, the Supreme Court reaches its decision. The final decision is that the practice has all along been wrong; that it has all along been wicked; that it has all along been unjustifiable; that it has all the time been condemned by the statute. But what has happened during the five or six years the case has been pending or the litigation going on? What about the competitor who stood there so weak that he needed aid and needed it at once? What about him? He has been driven into bankruptcy; he has quit the field; he is already ruined; perhaps he has been compelled to sell out to the combination.

I am not indulging in fancy, for the highways of commerce are strewn with evidence of the statements I am making. In almost every town and village of the land dead chimneys stand as a monument of the fact that an invader in the form of a trust has been there and has put out the fires in the furnaces of the smaller industries. What about the men who have been ruined? Is there any salvation for them in this bill? This bill, sir, is a letter of marque and reprisal authorizing the trusts to operate for four or five or six years, and at the end of that time to go unscathed.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, the Senator seems to forget that the operation of the trust is prohibited all the time.

Mr. REED. Oh, yes. Every time I drive you from this bill, every time I show you that this bill is so absurd and ridiculous that it can not be defended, you take refuge in the old Sherman Act. You all act like a Kansas farmer who, when he sees a cloud as big as a man's hand, ducks into his cyclone cellar. The Sherman Act is the cyclone cellar for the defenders of this bill. When they can no longer defend this bill they cry out, "We have the Sherman Act." If the Sherman Act covers these practices, why obstruct the statute books with an unnecessary law?

Mr. WALSH. It does not; but it covers the operations of the trusts. That is what the Senator is talking about. The trust, the unlawful combination the Senator is talking about, is all the time amenable to criminal prosecution; but the Senator always argues upon the assumption that it is not.

Mr. REED. Oh, no; I do not; I never made such an argument in my life. I do not mean to answer my friend abruptly, but he never heard such a statement fall from my lips or the suggestion of such a statement.

Mr. WALSH. I interrupted the Senator because the Senator said, substantially, that the trusts, the unlawful combinations, will continue in these unlawful practices while the procedure takes its regular course through the Trade Commission and eventually crush their independent creditors.

Mr. REED. Exactly; and the Senator fully understood that I was talking about what the trusts can do under this bill. The record will show that I have so said not once but twenty times.

Mr. WALSH. But meanwhile the trusts will be subject to criminal prosecution every day.

Mr. REED. Oh, yes, Mr. President. Then, why are you putting this bill on the statute books? You are putting it on the statute books as an additional remedy; you are putting it on as something that is better than the trust act; you are putting it on to reach the case of the big man and the little man.

Mr. WALSH. To reach the case of the man who is not subject to prosecution under the Sherman Act because he does not stand in the attitude of a trust or an unlawful combination.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the Senator's views are at variance with the views laid down in the House report. I will come back and argue that in a moment, if the Senator can restrain his impatience long enough to let me conclude one thing at a time.

Mr. WALSH. I will try not to interrupt the Senator again.

Mr. REED. I am perfectly willing to be interrupted, but always these interruptions come just at the time one is about to conclude the discussion of a question.

I say under this bill, and so far as it is concerned, the trust magnate or the man, whether he be big or whether he be little, can resort to all the delays I have named, and during the time his rival is being destroyed and driven from the field can be pocketing the profits of his buccaneering expedition, and at the end of it all, so far as this bill is concerned, he keeps the money he has gained. All the commission can do is to tell him he must stop the particular practice. Whereupon he thrusts his hands into his pockets, fingers his profits, and looks for new fields of enterprise where he may with equal safety pursue similar methods.

What about the people who are to be considered? Can they recover anything? There may be here and there some large dealer who will be able to show sufficient damages to warrant him in bringing a suit, but the great consuming public, which buys at retail and which is robbed a penny or a farthing upon each little purchase, is remediless. The toll has been collected; the blood has been drawn from the people's veins drop by drop; they may look a little pale and anemic, but they can not prove their damages in any court on earth; and yet they have been grievously damaged.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I do not want to interrupt the Senator except to correct him in his statement of what I said. I did not say that these are the practices of trusts and monopolies alone, nor that they are to be prohibited as such. These are the practices of trusts and monopolies, and when they are



the practices of trusts and monopolies those trusts and monopolies are subject to prosecution under the Sherman antitrust law. Unfortunately, however, they are the practices of business organizations that are not trusts and monopolies, and those are the things that this bill is intended to reach.

Mr. REED. Does the Senator claim that this bill was not intended to reach the big man as well as the little man?

Mr. WALSH. Why, of course it was intended to reach the big man who can not be reached under the Sherman Act.

Mr. REED. Does the Senator say that it was not intended to reach the big trust as well as the little concern?

Mr. WALSH. The Senator from Montana asserts that it was not intended to reach the trust, big or little; that the trust is reached by the Sherman Act. It was intended to reach the business organization that can not be reached by the Sherman Act, that is not subject to it.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the Senator from Montana does not stand with the committee of the Senate, and he does not stand with the committee of the House, and he does not stand with the President of the United States, whose message I read here yesterday. I now read from the report of the committee of the House. Let us see whether this legislation was intended only to affect the small man.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator from Montana has said that that is not the case. It is intended to reach the big man, no matter how big he is, who can not be reached by the Sherman Act.

Mr. REED. Let us see if it was not intended to reach the trust and if it was not intended to reach trust practices, born in the brain of a trust, worked out through trust methods, and the profits carried over and put into the coffers of the trust. I read from the House report on the bill:

The Committee on the Judiciary, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 15657) to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes, report the same back with the recommendation that the bill be amended as follows:

Your committee, after the delivery of a message by the President of the United States, on January 20 last, to the Congress, making certain recommendations relating to the matter of trusts and monopolies—

Not of little men, not of retailers, but "making certain recommendations relating to the matter of trusts and monopolies"—immediately prepared and published tentative bills which were designed to give legislative expression to the views contained in the President's message, and in order that the country might be given ample time to discuss them the committee conducted public hearings until April 4, at which time they were concluded.

The bill is not designed to destroy or hinder business, but, on the contrary, to help business and the whole people of the country who are related to or affected by it. The able and patriotic message of the President has been ever before us and the program which he proposed is contained in the provisions of the bill, and if enacted into law will in truth be "additional articles in our constitution of peace—the peace which is honor and freedom and prosperity."

There is not a word there about the little fellow. We are dealing with trusts and monopolies; and the President's message that I read yesterday and that I shall not take time to read again dealt with trusts and monopolies.

Now, I read a little further:

Every concern that engages in this evil practice must of necessity recoup its losses in the particular communities or sections where their commodities are sold below cost or without a fair profit by raising the price of this same class of commodities above their fair market value in other sections or communities.

Let us stop and analyze that for a minute. A concern must be a pretty large concern before it can indulge in this practice with any effect. It must be able, first, to stand the financial loss of cutting the price of an article in a trade territory below the cost of production, else it could not drive out a rival. Second, it must be able to withstand the financial drain for many months, perhaps for years. Third, it must be so large a concern that it not only covers the particular trade territory where its practice is being indulged, but it is so spread over the country that it can collect in other States and other communities the profits with which to sustain its unholy warfare.

Why, this can not apply to little things. A little concern can not employ such methods. It is only the large concern that can ever use them with any effect. And what says this report?

The necessity for such legislation is shown by the fact that 19 States have enacted laws forbidding this particular form of discrimination within their borders. These State statutes have practically all been enacted in the last few years, and most of them in the years 1911, 1912, and 1913. It is important that these State statutes be supplemented by additional legislation by Congress—

Now, listen to the description of one of your little things that is not a trust or monopoly:

for it is now possible for one of these great corporations doing business in not only the 48 States but throughout the world to lower the prices of its commodities in a particular State and sell within that State at a uniform price in compliance with State laws, and thereby

destroy the business of all independent concerns and competitors operating within the State.

And yet the Senator says this legislation was not intended to apply to anything but little concerns.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I never made the statement, and the Senator ought not to charge me with doing so. On the contrary, I expressly declared that it was intended to be applicable to anybody, no matter how big he was, and the bigger the more applicable it is.

Mr. REED. Very well; then it does apply to the trusts.

Mr. WALSH. Excuse me; it is not intended specifically to apply to the trusts that are already subject to prosecution.

Mr. REED. But does it or does it not apply to trusts?

Mr. WALSH. Why, it may. A trust may do these things; but the trust, when it does them, is liable every day to prosecution under the Sherman Act.

Mr. REED. And so is any individual who does them liable to prosecution under the Sherman Act. So also is a corporation, whether big or little, whenever it does them in a way to restrain trade; and if it does not do them in a way to restrain trade then, whether it is a big concern that we commonly call a trust, or whether it is a little concern that we commonly call a corporation, its acts are not unlawful and can not be reached under the Sherman Act.

This section of the bill was originally intended to have some practical effect. That intent has been nullified. As it passed the House, it is true, it would have taken some time to have enforced the statute. The delays of courts would have occurred. The wrongful practice might still have gone on for some time, and in the meantime a competitor might have been put out of business, but at the end of the litigation the trust magnate or the man indulging in the practice, big or little, was in danger of adorning his dishonest back with the stripes of a felon. But by this bill you say to him, "We will simply issue an order telling you that you must not do it any more."

Such a law is worse than farcical, because it is a betrayal. It is a pretense to the public that we are offering a remedy when we are offering no remedy that will effectuate any good end.

It is singular, but every time the conferees touched this bill they drew its teeth. I am aware of no single provision the conferees put in this bill that tended to make it a more drastic bill against trusts, combinations, monopolies, or restraints of trade.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, if the Senator would like information about the matter—

Mr. REED. I shall be glad to have it.

Mr. WALSH. I will call his attention to this fact: The Senator moved to amend by changing the word "is" to "may be." The language of the bill as it came from the House was "where the effect is to eliminate or substantially reduce competition." It was adopted by the Judiciary Committee, and as it came to the Senate it read in that way. The Senator himself moved to amend by substituting the words "may be" for "is." He made a very strong argument in favor of his amendment, a convincing argument. He convinced the Senate that that was the way it ought to be. We agreed with him. That amendment was adopted. I find that the Senate conferees, of whom I was not one, required the House conferees to yield to that amendment.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I have not intended to say that none of the Senate provisions went into the conference report. What I meant to say—and if I did not make myself plain, I will do so now—was that when the conferees got up an amendment of their own they invariably weakened this bill. They diluted it. I commented upon some of those changes on yesterday. I shall have more to comment upon as I proceed.

I repeat, it is a singular thing that whereas the conferees amended this bill in a number of particulars, I know of no single instance where they did not weaken the bill, so far as it bears upon trusts or monopolies.

Mr. WALSH. If the Senator would like some further light on that point, I think I can furnish it.

Mr. REED. I shall be glad to have it.

Mr. WALSH. In the same connection, I moved to strike out the provision, which was to the effect that if the effect of the things denounced by the act is to create a monopoly, they were made unlawful. The Senate refused to strike that out on my motion, but left it as it was—where the effect is to create a monopoly.

Mr. REED. In what section is that?

Mr. WALSH. In the same sections, 8 and 9. The Senate conferees changed that so as to make it where it may tend to create a monopoly. That made the provision very much more drastic.

Mr. REED. Did the Senator say section 9?

Mr. WALSH. Sections 2, 4, 7, and 8. I speak of the sections as they were. I do not know how they stand in the conference report. I will give them to the Senator.

Mr. CULBERSON. Sections 7 and 8 of the conference report are the ones to which the Senator from Montana refers. The Senator will find the first one at the bottom of page 5 of the conference report.

Mr. REED. Why, Mr. President, that whole clause is an assassination of the section itself.

Mr. WALSH. I will call the attention of the Senator to it.

Mr. REED. I refer to the one that the Senator from Texas, the chairman of the committee, has just called attention to. What was the section? I am referring now to section 3 of the conferees' report, which was section 2 of the House bill and corresponded to section 2 of the Senate bill, and which appears at the bottom of page 5 of the conference report.

Mr. WALSH. I refer the Senator to section 7.

Mr. REED. In a moment. I shall discuss the one that is called to my attention by the Senator from Texas and then I will take up the other.

The Senate bill and the House bill had absolutely prohibited the making of contracts which had tying clauses to them; the Senate bill, however, being limited to patented articles. In that form such a contract could not be made. The conferees, however, added the clause—

Where the effect of such lease, sale, or contract for sale, or such condition, agreement, or understanding may be to substantially lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce.

In other words, since this clause has been added, it is not enough, as I argued yesterday at length, to show that such a contract was made—which was sufficient under the House provision or under the Senate provision—but you must go further and show its effect to be to substantially lessen competition or to create a monopoly.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WARREN in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. REED. I do.

Mr. BORAH. How would it be possible for a person examining a separate act or transaction, individually, to determine whether or not that particular act had a tendency to create a monopoly? In other words, if you do not prohibit the tying of itself, almost any shrewd organizer of monopoly could show that the particular act which you had undertaken to prohibit would not tend to create a monopoly; that if it was created it would be in another way. So you can not look ahead and see what the effect of a particular act will be in the matter of creating a monopoly.

Mr. REED. The Senator's observation is, as most of his observations are, very lawyerlike and very wise. In support of that observation and in illustration of the fact that he has put his finger upon the very weakness of this measure I call attention to this fact: You may read every trust petition filed by the Government of the United States in the great number of trust suits it has brought and in no single instance, to my knowledge—I do not claim to have read them all, but I have read many—do you find the Government in its petition singling out any specific act and resting its case upon that act. On the contrary, the petition usually begins by attacking the method of organization. It sets forth a condition of facts showing that there was a bringing together under one control of a great many institutions, the tendency of the combination being to produce monopoly. These allegations are followed by pleading innumerable oppressive practices and acts such as local price cutting, the hiring of a competitor's employees, the slandering of a competitor's business, the effort to forestall him in his market where he purchases his raw material, the effort to drive him out of a particular corner by the rental of the property which he had expected to obtain—these and a multitude of other instances are all grouped together so that out of the vast mass of circumstances may be woven a mesh so fine that the trust proprietor can not escape. In no one of these cases can you find the Government bottoming its case upon one act.

Mr. BORAH and Mr. WALSH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield further to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. REED. In just a moment. The Senator from Montana has risen.

Mr. WALSH. I rose in response to the request of the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. REED. Very well.

Mr. WALSH. The section found on page 8 is section 7 of the conferees' report and is equivalent to section 6 of the bill

which passed the Senate. The first part of it, as the Senator recalls, deals with one corporation holding stock of another corporation; the second part deals with what is known as the holding corporation. The language of the bill originally was:

Where the effect of such acquisition or the use of such stock by the voting or granting of proxies or otherwise may be to eliminate or substantially lessen competition between such corporations, or any of them, whose stock or other share capital is so acquired, or to create a monopoly of any line of trade in any section or community.

The conferees made it read:

Or to restrain such commerce in any section or community or tend to create a monopoly of any line of commerce.

In the latter part of the section the conferees changed the language "or to create a monopoly" to the language "or tend to create a monopoly." I thought that that strengthened the bill rather than weakened it.

Mr. REED. If those clauses stood alone, they would strengthen the bill, as also would the other two interpolations made by the conferees, which I read:

Or to restrain such commerce in the section or community.

Those words appear twice. If those words alone had been added by the conferees they would have strengthened this section. But, Mr. President, the conferees put back the word "substantially."

Mr. WALSH. Does it not occur to the Senator that that is a separate change? I understand the Senator believes that to weaken the bill. Let us dismiss that. Let us agree with the Senator that that weakens the bill.

Mr. REED. Very well.

Mr. WALSH. Now take the other and consider it separately.

Mr. REED. But it can not be considered separately, as I am going to try to show, and I shall be as fair as I know how to be in discussing this report. I say that the words "or to restrain such commerce in any section or community" do strengthen the bill, but they are not here alone. At the same time the conferees restored those words they put in the word "substantially," so that the words put in do not mean "or to restrain such commerce in any section or community," but they mean to substantially restrain such commerce in any section or community, which is a very different thing. That word "substantially" I have protested against. It is there to qualify these new words. So we do not get their full benefit. However, I will say to the Senator frankly, if the phrase interpolated by the conferees had gone into the bill alone, it would have strengthened it.

Now, Mr. President, coming again to section 2 of the conference report, I call attention to the fact that in addition to cutting out the criminal penalties which are the very vitals of that section, without which, as I have argued here at length, it has no potentiality, will produce no results, and will protect nobody, the conferees have added a qualifying clause, which follows the language providing that goods shall not be sold at different prices in the same or different communities, and that clause is:

Where the effect of such discrimination may be to substantially lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce.

Again, they have added the words:

Or discrimination in price in the same or different communities made in good faith to meet competition.

I do not object to the last clause, but as to the former let us give it a moment's attention—the seven Senators who are present.

SEVERAL SENATORS. There are nine.

Mr. REED. I am corrected; there are nine Senators present. Let us give it attention, and I say now, as Senator LA FOLLETTE once said on this floor, "If we do not attend, the country will." What is meant by the phrase "where the effect of such discrimination may be to substantially lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce"?

Mr. President, when you prove that you have made out a case under the Sherman Act, as I understand the decisions. So the effect of this whole section is, you shall not discriminate in price in such a way that you violate the Sherman Act, and if you do, we will take you before a commission that can not do anything to you except tell you to stop, instead of taking you before a court under the Sherman Act, fining you, and sending you to jail. If I am not mistaken in my construction of those qualifying words, you can not get a conviction under that section unless you are able to prove a case, which would entitle you to go to a jury in a prosecution under the Sherman Act.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, that statement strikes me as rather important.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield further to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. REED. I do.



Mr. WALSH. That is a case which challenges our very earnest attention, and I should like to inquire about it.

Where the effect of such discrimination may be to substantially lessen competition.

So if an individual should cut prices on another, and the effect of that cutting would be to substantially lessen competition, he would be amenable to the Sherman Act?

Mr. REED. If I am correct, the term "substantially lessen competition" is synonymous with the term "restraint of trade." I have argued that—

Mr. WALSH. The Senator must bear in mind that section 1 of the Sherman Act deals simply with combinations and conspiracies. That contemplates the union of two or more organizations. That is not this case. The second clause says that it is criminal to create or attempt to create a monopoly. That is not this at all. You may not attempt to create a monopoly at all; you may not create a monopoly; but if you do a thing which tends to create a monopoly, you are amenable under this bill.

Mr. REED. The Senator is wrong in his analysis of the Sherman Act, in my opinion, and I want to be plain in what I am saying now in regard to this section. I am not setting up my opinion as final upon it. I am not saying that I am necessarily right; but I am arguing and appealing to Senators to consider it. I am giving my opinion, which I frankly say I may change, but which I do not think I am likely to change. I hold that the words "substantially lessen competition" have no other meaning than "restraint of trade"; and that therefore this section means nothing different than it would if it were to read "where the effect of such discrimination may be to restrain trade." I argued that at great length yesterday, and I do not intend at this time to cover the same ground. If I am correct in that, it could be, in my judgment, met under the Sherman Act. As I understand the decisions under that act, it is not necessary to prove that an actual restraint of trade has been worked.

Mr. WALSH. I will say to the Senator that he ignores the essential part of section 1 of the Sherman Act, which relates to combinations and conspiracies in restraint of trade.

Mr. REED. That section applies to more than mere combinations. There are two sections. The Sherman Act covers the act in combination and it covers the individual action.

Mr. WALSH. Exactly; section 2 covers the individual act.

Mr. REED. Section 1 reads:

Every contract, combination in form of trust or otherwise, or conspiracy in restraint of trade or commerce among the several States or with foreign nations is hereby declared to be illegal.

I do not think that section is limited to conspiracies. I do not think that language is—

Mr. WALSH. Combination contracts.

Mr. REED. Every contract. You can cut out all the rest of it except in restraint of trade. It does not say every contract and combination in restraint of trade, but every contract, and then follows the language:

Every person who shall make any such contract or engage in any such combination.

All that is necessary is to make a contract which restrains trade. It can be done by an individual or it can be done by a combination of individuals. That is my opinion, and I think I can satisfy the Senator on that point, but I can not do it now, for I have no time to go and get the law books. However, I think if the Senator will examine it himself he will arrive at the conclusion that an individual may be guilty of restraint of trade under the Sherman Act.

Mr. President, while these interruptions are very entertaining and I do not complain of them, they are taking some time and throwing me a little off of the thread of what I intended to talk about. I am not engaged in any filibuster or attempt to consume time. I believe I could have, without interruption, concluded what I wanted to say on yesterday.

#### HOLDING COMPANIES FAVORED.

I desire to call the attention of the Senate now to sections 7 and 8. As I have already discussed the word "substantially," inserted in these sections, I pass the sections with simply one observation: When you give to a holding company the full right to own the stock of other companies and then impose upon the Government the duty before it can prohibit that holding to show that there has been a substantial lessening of competition, you have required it to show more than it is necessary for it now to show under the Sherman Act. The section, in my opinion, in its present form is without the slightest value.

The criminal penalty also is here stricken out. I want to know why it should be stricken out. No man ever organized a holding company and substantially restricted competition who did not do so with his eyes open. He did not err through inadvertence. The reason he organized that holding company in

the first instance was to lessen competition. That is what holding companies are for.

Will somebody tell me why a man who deliberately sits down with his lawyer and evolves a scheme to organize a company to hold the stock of 10, 20, or 30 companies that are in competition, thus effectuating a monopoly through the form of one company instead of a trust through the form of a trust agreement—will some one tell me why the man who does that should not be fined, should not be imprisoned, should not be treated at least as severely as we treat a man who does not pay a license on a box of cigars that he has made in the back room of his house?

#### SMALL OFFENDERS PUNISHED—GREAT CRIMINALS ESCAPE.

We have no difficulty in prescribing criminal penalties for the little fellow. We can with the knife of the law disembowel the little criminal and smile at his expressions of agony. We can, without compunction, arrest a poor, unlettered fellow who has been reared away off in the mountains and who regards it as a sort of a God-given privilege to make whisky and not pay any Government license, who has a little still that cost about \$10 originally and has been handed down from father to son unto the tenth generation. We have not a bit of difficulty in putting that poor fellow in jail, not because he made the whisky, but because he did not pay the tax. But, then, he is only a little fellow. He wears plain, common clothes. His boots are coarse and run down at the heels. He does not shave every day. He is just an ordinary individual; besides, he is poor. We throw him in jail without the slightest hesitation. His overworked wife may trudge along the stony paths of the mountain totting little baskets of vegetables to the market to get money upon which she may live while the father of the household is in jail. There is no trouble about sending the moonshiner to jail or keeping him in jail. He has not robbed anybody; he just beat the Government out of a little tax, that is all.

But when a gentleman sits down behind a mahogany desk along with a lot of other gentlemen who look like they own the diamond mines of South Africa, the case is quite different. These wealthy gentlemen are consorting together for the purpose of getting up a scheme to rob entire communities, to crush great business concerns, to bankrupt States, to put out the fires in the furnaces of a hundred factories, and in the end to pilfer and flich with monopoly's cruel fingers from the pockets of the poor and the needy. They intend to gather the farthings and the pence and the nickels and the dimes from thousands of homes and pile them up in the vaults of banks. They intend to unload a vast amount of watered stock upon the unwary. They intend out of the accumulated profits to pay for bacchanalian feasts. They contemplate plowing the oceans with yachts big enough for trans-Atlantic steamers. They intend to take a part of the criminal loot and with it capitalize the campaigns of those who are willing to do their service in public places, to bribe legislators with their evil gains, to buy the souls of men, to even pollute the bench and stain the ermine of the judge—when such as these are to be dealt with we do it through a commission. This is the frightful, the bloody, penalty we intend to inflict. We shall say to them in mild and gentle accents, sweet as the notes of an æolian harp, "Dear respected friends, we are very sorry, but really you must quit it."

That is the whole trouble, sir, with our civilization; it is the rotten spot of American jurisprudence. We usually have one law for the impoverished and the same law for the wealthy, but when we come to the application of the law we enforce it against the man in rags and we fail to enforce it against the man in broadcloth. Just now we are making a law for the rich rogues; we are making it for the public plunderers; we are making it for the buccaneers of commerce; we are making it for the pirates who sail the high seas of trade, and in dealing with them our touch is as tender and as harmless as the kiss of a mother to the cheek of her first born. We do not send them to jail. Ah, no; we investigate them before a commission.

"DEMOCRATIC PARTY PLEDGED TO ENFORCE CRIMINAL PENALTIES AGAINST TRUSTS."—BRYAN.

We are playing the hypocrite, sir. We came here sounding our cymbals, girding up our loins, burnishing our weapons; we said to all the world, "When this great Democratic host shall assemble, when it shall bear down upon the citadels of greed, of corruption, of plunder—ah, then you will see how valiant arms, backed by honest hearts, will hew a clean path for the common people to tread." But now, having marched up the hill to the heroic voices of the bugles of war, we are sitting down by the camp fire and attuning our ears to the seductive notes of Home, Sweet Home. Some of us will hear from home—not now; the people are hypnotized just now, some

of them. But I have never seen a fraud put off upon the American people that at the end of 10 days there was not somebody in every community who knew about it, and at the end of six months everybody in every community knew about it.

Have we promised criminal penalties? I read you the platform—one platform only, though I might have read many—demanding these criminal penalties. I also call your attention to the fact that we are here pledged, not by platforms alone, but by the utterances of our great men. Ah, I have been following those men, and I hope that as the years go by I may still follow them as with flaming swords they stand in front of the hosts of the people to battle against those who live by plundering the people. I read:

Other criminal laws are enforced against all offenders who can be found; why should we draw a distinction between the horse thief who violates the law against horse stealing and the trust magnate who violates the law against trusts?

Let me paraphrase that: "Why should we draw a distinction between the horse thief who violates the law of horse stealing and the organizer of a holding company who is engaged in creating a trust through that corporate form?" I read further:

The Senator [Mr. Beveridge] complains because I have said that private monopoly must be eliminated, that the trust must be destroyed root and branch.

Let me interpolate, that was the doctrine of the Bull Moose—not to destroy monopolies, but to regulate them; not to carry them to the courts of justice, but to a commission; but said this great man whom I now am quoting in reply to Mr. Beveridge:

That is my position—that is, to destroy them root and branch—and that position was set forth in the Democratic national platform in 1900 and was endorsed by more than 6,000,000 voters.

Again, this great statesman said:

In the beginning the executive officers thought the civil part of the statute sufficient, and attempted to break up the trusts by injunction. That proving unsatisfactory, resort was next had to the criminal provisions of the law with the idea that a fine would be sufficient. The fine has been shown to be ineffective, and the President is turning more and more toward the imprisonment clause. It is useless to attempt to prevent combinations by fine levied against corporations when the fines are small compared with the sums made by the combination. Imprisonment, however, is real punishment, and the trust magnates will become scarce as soon as the penitentiary doors close upon a few of the offenders.

That is the language of William Jennings Bryan, the present Secretary of State, honored by the President with the highest position within his gift. That, sir, is yet the doctrine of the Democratic Party. You may strike out the criminal penalties of this bill; but I say to you that the aroused conscience of the American people will demand their restoration. You may, instead of providing courts and juries and jails for the great criminal, provide that he shall go before a commission, as you do by this section, and that the commission may finally tell him he must quit his practices and let him go free; but the day is coming when you will be obliged to write criminal penalties into this statute, and I predict they will be more severe when written in than those you have stricken from this bill.

If, sir, in the opinion of Mr. Bryan the Sherman law was not sufficiently drastic or was not enforced in a sufficiently drastic manner, what shall be said of this law, which proposes to say to the man who has organized a holding company for the purpose of creating a monopoly, "You can not even be fined; you can not be sent to jail; nothing can be done to you, sir, except you will be told to quit?"

I call attention to this statement. It is no anemic, expurgated thing; it is not of uncertain meaning; it has red blood in it, the fire of battle animates it, the courage of the statesman blazes through it.

#### CHAMP CLARK'S POSITION.

If I had my way, I would fill the penitentiaries and jails of the United States so full of trust magnates that their arms and legs would stick out of the windows.

That was the declaration of honest CHAMP CLARK. There is nothing in anything CLARK ever said that suggests a reprimand before a commission for a monopolist.

I shall be met with the argument that I am still fighting the commission. I never fought the commission. What I have objected to and object to now is the denuding of the courts of the authority that ought to be reposed in them and transferring the care of great criminals to a tribunal that is as impotent to prevent their evil practices as is the weak arm of a child to choke to death a Numidian lion.

In May, 1908, the American Lawyer, at pages 267 and 268, printed this:

Government ownership and Government regulation by commissions are not radically different and will be discredited by experience. Regulation by definite prohibitions of law is the effective process.

That was the contribution of Woodrow Wilson to the thought of the time. It was a wise statement; it was a profound utterance; it has the ring that goes with sincerity of purpose.

Mr. President, I could read to the Senate for hours similar pledges made by great Democrats. In my own small and weak way I have uttered equivalent expressions. I believe that the doctrine of prohibition with a criminal penalty attached to the prohibition is an essential part of the Democratic creed.

Mr. President, I raise the question of a quorum.

Mr. LEA of Tennessee. Mr. President, I make the point of order that no business has intervened since the last roll call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] suggests the absence of a quorum. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. LEA] makes the point of order that no business has intervened since the last call for a quorum.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, as I remember, after the lack of a quorum was shown, there was a motion made instructing the Sergeant at Arms to request the attendance of absent Senators.

Mr. LEA of Tennessee. But not after the result of the roll call was announced.

Mr. SMOOT. I think the motion was made after the result was announced, and that the RECORD will so show.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I am very much obliged to my friend the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. LEA]. He is very courteous; I can not refrain from expressing my appreciation. In the Senate at the present time is the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER].

Mr. LEA of Tennessee. I dislike to interrupt the compliment to myself, but I make the point that no debate is in order.

Mr. REED (continuing). The Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Debate is proceeding by unanimous consent, of course. The Chair believes that there has been sufficient business to authorize the suggestion of the absence of a quorum, and the Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bankhead	Lee, Md.	Perkins	Smoot
Bryan	Lewis	Polindexter	Stone
Chamberlain	McCumber	Pomerene	Swanson
Culberson	Martin, Va.	Reed	Thornton
Fletcher	Martine, N. J.	Robinson	Vardaman
Gore	Nelson	Shafroth	Walsh
Hughes	Norris	Sheppard	Warren
Kern	O'Gorman	Shields	Williams
Lane	Overman	Shively	
Lea, Tenn.	Page	Simmons	

Mr. SHAFROTH. I desire to announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. THOMAS] by leave of the Senate, and to state that he is paired with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. Root].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirty-eight Senators have answered to their names. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the roll of the absentees.

The Secretary called the names of absent Senators, and Mr. CHILTON, Mr. SMITH of Maryland, and Mr. WEST answered to their names when called.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia, Mr. BORAH, Mr. WEEKS, Mr. WHITE, Mr. HITCHCOCK, Mr. ASHURST, Mr. THOMPSON, and Mr. JOHN-SON entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I am delighted to know that 49 Senators have answered to their names, but by actual count there are not 16 Senators in the Chamber now.

Mr. ASHURST. And there will be less in a few minutes.

Mr. REED. And there will be less in a few minutes, as is said by the Senator from Arizona. Incidentally, I venture the remark that two-thirds of those who are not here have not read the conference report. I am not complaining on my own account. Having for a long period of my life been accustomed to address 12 men who could not get away, because they were in charge of a sheriff, I view with great delight the fact that 6 more than are necessary for a jury voluntarily remain.

The result of this bill concerns me no more than it does the other Members of the Senate. I have a great deal of sympathy for Senators who absent themselves from the Chamber. The fact that I am addressing the Senate is perhaps a sufficient excuse.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

Mr. REED. If the Senator will allow me, I should like to finish this sentence.

Mr. BORAH. I simply want to say that one of the Senator's jury has gotten away.

Mr. REED. I felt that virtue had departed—not from myself, but from the Senate Chamber—when I noticed the vanishing coat tails of the last gentleman who left. [Laughter.]



Mr. President, a condition of indifference, resulting from fatigue, apparently exists at both ends of the Capitol. The cry is that things must be done at the present moment. The disposition of many Senators is to pass this bill regardless of its provisions, for I have heard that sentiment expressed repeatedly. The word is being circulated, "Pass this bill, and we will amend it hereafter."

In this condition of mind we approach the most important legislation that has been or that will be before this Congress. In my judgment, men will vote upon this bill who have never read the conference report, who have neither read the bill nor heard a word of the discussion. That, of course, is for them to do if they see fit so to do; but the fact remains that we are here, under these conditions, legislating for 90,000,000 people, not for to-day, not for to-morrow, but for many years in the future. The policies we determine by this legislation will affect, for weal or woe, the people of this great country.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator pardon an interruption here?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. REED. I do.

Mr. WALSH. I was particularly careful not to interrupt the Senator while he was indulging in such observations of a general character as he cared to make in connection with the section of the bill which now receives his attention; that is, the holding-company section.

The Senator will recall that when the bill was before the Senate I moved to amend it so as to outlaw holding companies absolutely. The Senator voted with me upon my amendment, as I perceive by the RECORD now before me. I desire, however, to call his attention to the fact that with respect to that matter, as well as with respect to the penalty clause, the conferees carried out the instructions of the Senate.

The Senate refused to take out the provision in relation to holding companies, and it took out the provision in relation to penalties. The conferees did what was their duty—to maintain the provisions as the Senate wrote them, if they could. They seem to have done so.

I desire to inquire of the Senator now if he feels that it is quite fair to those of us who deem it our duty to sit here and listen to the Senator to detain us upon the question of the adoption or rejection of the conference report, with a criticism of the measure as it stands now, when the conferees did just exactly what the Senate directed them to do?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I do not desire to detain the Senator at all, whether my discussion be fair or unfair. Of course, his presence is always a delight to me; but while his vacation of the room would wound me very deeply, I nevertheless do not desire him to stay if he regards remaining as in the nature of a punishment. I have seen fit to comment upon this bill in a general way, because it is very difficult to select just a particular item. I am contending that this bill ought to go back to conference, and I am contending that when it does go back to conference every criminal penalty ought to be restored, and that the House conferees, who represent the body that first wrote these criminal penalties into the sections, ought to be willing to put them back, and that our conferees ought not to oppose it.

Mr. WALSH. But, Mr. President, I wish to inquire of the Senator whether it was not the duty of the conferees to insist that they should not go back, since that was the vote of the Senate?

Mr. REED. Oh, perhaps on this one section; but why pause to discuss such a question? There are plenty of cases where they yielded that which the Senate had gained, and I am about to discuss one of the most important of those propositions.

I call attention to section 14 of the conference report. There has been a change worked here which apparently, at first glance, is innocent, but which, taken in connection with the other things the conferees did, absolutely, or almost absolutely, destroys the effect of the provision.

When this bill came to us from the House it provided:

That whenever a corporation shall violate any of the provisions of the antitrust laws such violation shall be deemed to be also that of the individual directors, officers, or agents of such corporation who shall have authorized, ordered, or done any of the acts, etc.

A penalty of \$5,000 fine, or imprisonment, or both, was prescribed for these officers. As the bill came to us the section was of great potentiality, because by a number of sections the House had provided criminal penalties. These sections as they came to us from the House were penal sections. Therefore, when we provided that any officer of any corporation who was a party to the violation by that corporation of any of the penal antitrust acts should be criminally liable we reached the officers of great

numbers of corporations who will be brought within the purview of this bill.

The conferees, however, took all of the penal clauses out of the antitrust legislation contained in this bill, and kept the word "penal" in the provision relating to the officers of corporations; and as the penal provisions are stricken out, this section has not left in it a particle of vitality so far as trusts or monopolies are concerned. It will now be held, and must be held, to apply only to the section that deals with railroad securities, and I believe with banks.

The section as now drawn does not apply as it would before these penal clauses were stricken out. It is almost as though we had stricken out all criminal clauses from the bill, and then said that any officer who permits a corporation to violate any of the penal clauses, there not being any, shall be sent to the penitentiary.

Let us apply the section. Suppose a corporation goes out and organizes a holding company. Suppose it restrains trade through the holding company. You undertake under this provision to arrest its officers. You can not hold them, because the act of the corporation is not denounced as a penal act.

#### SECTION 26 STRICKEN OUT.

Mr. President, I desire to call attention to two other sections, which were inserted in the Senate and stricken out by the conferees. I refer first to section 26.

It shall be unlawful for any corporation engaged in commerce to do any business in any State contrary to the laws of the State under which said corporation was created or contrary to the laws of the State in which it may be doing business. The District of Columbia shall be deemed a State within the meaning of this section.

Let us give that section a few moments' consideration.

It shall be unlawful for any corporation engaged in commerce to do any business in any State contrary to the laws of the State under which said corporation was created.

That is the first clause. Why should anyone object to that? Why should a corporation be permitted to do business contrary to the very laws that breathed into it the breath of life?

I shall wait a long time for any man to answer that question on ethical grounds. The man who undertakes to answer it must assume the position that it is right for one of these artificial bodies to violate the very law of its existence, and to do the very thing that the power which created it said it should not do. The opponent of this provision must contend that he is unwilling to punish an institution for violating law. He must place himself side by side with the concern that breaks the law that gave it life.

The second clause of the section is as follows:

Or contrary to the laws of the State in which it may be doing business.

Again I ask, why should that clause be stricken out? An individual can not do business in a State contrary to the laws of that State. Why should we hesitate to add the strength of the Government to the protection of a State against an institution created in some other State which enters its domain and violates its laws?

Why should this Government that possesses the exclusive right to regulate interstate commerce deny to a State protection against a corporation which enters its borders and violates its laws? With that section in the statute it is my opinion that two-thirds of the trusts of this country would be forced to dissolve to-morrow. With it out they still will exercise the same privileges they at present enjoy.

That section was added in the Senate. I must assume that the Senate conferees contended for it. It would be interesting to know upon what basis the House conferees refused their concurrence. I challenge gentlemen to stand in the open and tell us why a corporation should be permitted to engage in interstate commerce that violates the law of the State that gave it birth or violates the law of the State in which it transacts business.

#### SECTION 25, PROVIDING FOR REAL DISSOLUTION OF TRUSTS, ELIMINATED.

Mr. President, when this bill was before the Senate I offered an amendment, which appears as section 25 and which reads as follows:

SEC. 25. That whenever a corporation shall acquire or consolidate the ownership or control of the plants, franchises, or property of other corporations, copartnerships, or individuals, so that it shall be adjudged to be a monopoly or combination in restraint of trade, the court rendering such judgment shall decree its dissolution and shall to that end appoint receivers to wind up its affairs and shall cause all of its assets to be sold in such manner and to such persons as will, in the opinion of the court, restore competition as fully and completely as it was before said corporation or combination began to be formed. The court shall reserve in its decree jurisdiction over said assets so sold for a sufficient time to satisfy the court that full and free competition is restored and assured.

That amendment was accepted by the Senate. It is stricken out by the conferees. Once more the trusts win. No word of



criticism was offered against the section on the floor of the Senate, and no successful criticism can now be made. It was offered to meet a real evil. All of us know that many of the trust decisions, wrought out as the result of much travail and time and money expended, have practically been of no value to the people. The Department of Justice has spent months in digging out of musty tomes and dusty archives the evidence to demonstrate that the primary organization of a trust was violative of the law. It has sent its agents, at the expense of hundreds of thousands of dollars, to gather evidence in every nook, corner, and cranny of the land. Its attorneys have been met in the tribunals of justice by the most skilled advocates the monopolies could employ, and at the end of a long and arduous battle the Government has gained its case. Then this suit, brought for the purpose of relieving against monopoly—this suit, bottomed upon the fact that there was an unlawful combination—this suit, in which it was alleged that a great number of independent concerns had been brought together into one concern for the purpose of plundering and plucking the people of the land—this suit, that had these purposes for its basis and its aim, has too often resulted in a decree that left the situation worse than it was before the case was brought. The victory has been turned to disaster because courts, like Congresses, seem to be unable to look two or three hundred million dollars in the face without blinking their eyes. I am not presenting only my individual opinion. I call attention to a letter that came from the Attorney General's Office a few weeks ago, which I read into the Record. It contains this statement:

The fundamental weakness in the enforcement of the antitrust act in previous administrations was the failure to insist upon a real dissolution of monopolies and combinations which the courts had adjudged unlawful.

The prosecution had to be begun in response to the voice of outraged public opinion, it had to be carried on for the same reason, the decision had to be secured for the same reason, and then, having gained the victory, the people were at the end robbed of the fruitage of the labor. This is the indictment brought by the Attorney General's Office. He does not say whether it was the fault of previous Attorneys General or the fault of the courts.

In such a condition as that, with such a fact as that before us, the plain duty of Congress is by law to provide that there shall be a real dissolution. Why do we pass antitrust laws? Is it that we shall have a long trial, a full hearing, eloquent arguments, logical briefs, and in the end not dissolve the thing we have denounced as a monster of the commercial world and as a menace to our country?

Why do we have these cases? Why do we bring them? Is it merely to allay public indignation, or is it to accomplish substantial results?

Now, if it be true that a combination has been formed and that it is a wicked thing, why should we not dissolve it into its constituent parts? You would have no difficulty in so providing for the little fellow. You would find no one shying at the proposition of putting the knife into his emaciated and skinny form and then turning the knife around. But when it is proposed by law to say to a combination that has a capital of a billion dollars, you shall be dissolved into your constituent parts, the loot shall be disgorged, the decree shall be a real mandate of dissolution, the punishment shall fit the offense, you can not get such a law passed—not in this Congress.

I read you what the Attorney General's Office had to say about the past dissolutions. We did not need the word of the Attorney General's Office. All we needed to do was to listen to the ticker on Wall Street, which told the story of many of these dissolutions in columns of figures that eloquently recorded the story of the profits of dissolution.

It seems that we might almost apply to these dissolution suits which were supposed to be the death of the trusts the philosophy of the fellow who had his life insured for \$100,000, and who, when some one warned him against reckless conduct, said, "It does not make any difference if I do get killed; I can make money by getting myself killed." These concerns after dissolution and death have been more valuable than they were before, if we can trust the stock market. The winding sheet seems to give an added value. The funeral is a profitable thing. The requiem sung over their corpses produces a resurrection and a new life, with enlarged opportunities and more dollars and cents in bank.

When I propose that we shall have a real decree, that there shall be a real burial, and that we shall sod down the grave upon the monster that was created in defiance of law, but that we shall at the same time preserve its parts and restore them to competition and activity, the conferees say, "You must not do

that. Gently, my friends; do not touch these great trusts with rude hands. Let the courts by easy methods persuade them to somewhat change their form without in so much as by a hair's breadth changing their methods."

FAKE DECREES AGAINST TRUSTS—STOCK OF DISSOLVED TRUSTS INCREASES IN VALUE—STANDARD OIL CASE.

When the Standard Oil case was in court and there was danger of some real legal surgery being performed that might divide it into parts and destroy its monopoly control and consequently cut off its monopoly profit, the stock actually declined to 585. Even in the period before the patient had been put on the judicial operating table the mere fact that the nurses were assembling and that the smell of anesthetics was in the operating room beat down the price of these stocks to 585. There was some chance that the knife might go deep enough to reach a vital point. But after the legal surgeons had made their incision it was discovered that they had not even stained the blades of their knives. The operation was bloodless and painless. The patient instantly recovered. Evidently it did not even experience a shock. Accordingly, its temperature, as recorded in the stock exchange the next day, was not only normal but health and vigor had been greatly increased by virtue of the remarkable judicial operation. The stock which had been 585 now registered 900. This result obtained because the patient had been discharged not only as completely cured but was certified as sound in wind, limb, and eyesight, and, moreover, was immune from any future punishment for any of the acts that had been then and there adjudicated.

Suppose we had had this statute on the books then; the Standard Oil Co. would have gone out of existence. It would not be able, as it is to-day, to go into States and by local price cutting destroy the independent concerns. It would not be able, as it is to-day, to cut down the price 10, 20, 30, 40, 60 per cent upon crude oil and close the markets of entire States whenever it sees fit so to do.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I want to say for the information of the Senator that this was the last amendment that was settled in the conference. It was considered from every standpoint. Our attention was called to a very important case in the Senator's own State with which the Senator is very familiar. The court said that in dissolving the corporation, as to selling them out, the public interest must be considered. The court said in the United States against St. Louis Terminal:

We come now to the remedy. In determining what this should be we, as said by this court in *Standard Oil Co. v. United States* (221 U. S., 1, 78), must not overlook the fact that in applying a remedy "that injury to the public by the prevention of an undue restraint on or the monopolization of trade or commerce is the foundation upon which the prohibitions of the statute rest, and moreover that one of the fundamental purposes of the statute is to protect, not to destroy, the rights of property." If, as we have already said, the combination of two or more mere terminal companies into a single system does not violate the prohibition of the statute against contracts and combinations in restraint of interstate commerce, it is because such a combination may be of the greatest public utility. But when, as here, the inherent conditions are such as to prohibit any other reasonable means of entering the city, the combination of every such facility under the exclusive ownership and control of less than all of the companies under compulsion to use them violates both the first and second sections of the act, in that it constitutes a contract or combination in restraint of commerce among the States and an attempt to monopolize commerce among the States which must pass through the gateway at St. Louis.

In the Senator's own State, in the city of St. Louis, I think, there were some 39 corporations that had their terminals; and, quoting from the opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States, the court said if all those corporations were sold out and dissolved it would have been impossible for the great railroads to secure rights of way through that great city; that it would have been impossible for them to have different stations for each railroad and detrimental to the public interests.

St. Louis is a city of great magnitude in the extent of its area, its population, and its manufacturing and other business. A very large number of trunk-line railroads converge in this city. In the brief of one of the well-informed counsel in this case it is said that St. Louis is one of the largest railroad centers in the world. Suppose it were required of every railroad company to effect its entrance to this city as best it could and establish its own terminal facilities, we would have a large number of passenger stations, freight depots, and switch yards scattered all over the vast area and innumerable vehicles employed in hauling passengers and freight to and from those stations and depots. Or suppose it became necessary in the exigency of commerce that all incoming trains should reach a common focus, but every railroad company provide its own track—

Mr. REED. For the sake of getting myself right, I wish to ask if the Senator was asking me a question?

Mr. OVERMAN. I want to show our reason for finally yielding on this matter after a contention for weeks. I should like if the Senator will kindly yield to me to show how it would work in a corporation in my own State.

Mr. REED. I will yield.

Mr. OVERMAN. There was a tobacco company there. The American Tobacco Co. owned 51 per cent of its capital stock,



The owner of the 49 per cent of the stock brought suit against the American Tobacco Co. to dissolve the corporation and also brought suit for damages and also to get the stock back, because it had been obtained under a false representation, as I understand. They took that State corporation into the Federal court in my State and removed it to a Federal court in New Jersey and made it a party in New Jersey to the celebrated American Tobacco case. One man, who owned the 49 per cent, was taken to New Jersey, out of his own State, and made a party to this American Tobacco Co.'s case. The Senator will find that fact stated in the Supreme Court decision in that case. Now, if there had been a receiver appointed, as this amendment provided, this man who had been contending against the company would have had his property sold out entirely, with nobody to buy it, and 49 per cent of the stock would have gone into the scrap pile. There would have been \$40,000,000 worth of property sold out in the entire property of the American Tobacco Co. in my State, with nobody to buy, if you had compelled the court to sell out.

Therefore to punish one man you might injure 10,000 innocent men, and, as the Supreme Court says, the public interest, the interest of innocent people, must be thought of in connection with dissolution and appointment of receivers. If it could have been worked out to protect innocent people, it ought to have been done, and the courts should not be put in a strait-jacket.

Mr. REED. Yes; and who are the innocent people? The innocent people are the 90,000,000 people of the United States. They are not the mere stockholders of the trusts and corporations.

The argument which the Senator has just made amounts to nothing more than this—that the trusts and combinations must be kept, because we can not dissolve them without doing more harm than we do good.

Mr. OVERMAN. No; Mr. President, not dissolved, but selling them out.

Mr. REED. If it is true that you can not dissolve them without doing more harm than good, then let us repeal our trust and monopoly statutes and embark upon a new public policy.

Mr. OVERMAN. Does the Senator think he is fair there when he uses the word "dissolution"? The question is as to a receivership and selling them out. The court uses the language to sell out. That was the question. That was the Senator's amendment.

Mr. REED. Very well. How will you work a dissolution that is a real dissolution without a sale? How are you going to dissolve a corporation? How do you ordinarily dissolve a corporation by any court except through the appointment of a receiver?

The Senator objects to the word "sale." Everyone understands, and these conferees must have understood, that any court of equity ordering a property of that kind sold, if it saw fit so to do, could divide the property into its original part and dispose of it by sale without the sacrifice of the property. There is no difficulty if we want to accomplish the task.

#### ST. LOUIS TERMINAL CASE.

The Senator [Mr. OVERMAN] referred to the St. Louis Terminal case—the court said that it had the right to dissolve that company, but that it would not do so. When the court took that position it denied the city of St. Louis the relief for which it had contended and battled for 25 years. If we had had this law, we would have had a real dissolution instead of the decision cited by the Senator, which, by the way, is now back again with the original court. The long, weary road to the Supreme Court is now once more being traveled, and still the old monopoly does business.

Let us see. There was a ferry across the Mississippi River known as the Wiggins Ferry. It carried trains of cars; it was the one entrance for cars coming from the East to the city of St. Louis, which is on the west bank of the river. Its prices were extortionate, so much so that it greatly burdened the commerce of that growing city. Thereupon a bridge was built to carry trains, which it was expected would be a rival of the Wiggins Ferry Co., and that thus, through rivalry, the rates would be reduced to a reasonable sum. I think they charged at that time 50 cents to haul a single passenger over that ferry when the passenger was in a train of cars. The rates upon freight were equally extortionate. The bridge was built. It had been built but a short time when it was discovered that the bridge and the ferry companies had been brought into one common control; the stock had been exchanged, the officers were the same, and the rates were the same.

Years went by. The manufacturers of the city of St. Louis found they could not compete with the manufacturers upon the Illinois side because they were compelled by this monopoly

to pay extortionate charges on freights crossing the river. Thereupon enterprising citizens, in the hope of relieving their city from this burden and to gain for it the advantages which naturally it ought to have, organized a company known as the Merchants' Bridge Co., the stock of which was to be owned by the local people. They obtained a charter from Congress. That charter expressly provided that if ever that bridge company came under the same control or pooled its earnings with the old monopoly the charter should be forfeited by virtue of that act. They had scarcely finished the bridge when they discovered that somebody had slipped down to Congress and had an amendment passed to the charter taking out the prohibitive provision regarding stock ownership. Thereupon the stock was pooled, a common control obtained, and, after having built the bridge at great expense, the people discovered that they had only added to the assets of the monopoly. I have a bill here now pending to forfeit the franchise of that bridge company.

Unable to get relief in the courts, the people of the city of St. Louis voted bonds to build another bridge; but when they came to arrange for its approaches sinister influences were at work, which three times have succeeded in defeating the issue of bonds to build an approach to the bridge. That very matter is still pending.

A great city has sprung up on the eastern bank of the river, where manufacturing industries have located because they could not locate on the western bank and pay the extortionate rates. If the justices of the Supreme Court of the United States had known the situation as the citizens of St. Louis knew it, they would not have argued that harm would come; they would have dissolved this miserable monopoly; they would have broken the shackles upon the commerce of the great southwestern metropolis; they would have given new life and new energy to that people and to that community, and the blessings of the fathers and the mothers and the children would have been upon them. The case cited by my friend from North Carolina is a very unfortunate illustration.

Representing the people of Missouri in part, I am prepared to say that St. Louis will build a monument in its chief public grounds; it will construct it of Parian marble and it will surmount it with the bust, in heroic proportions, of the man who will dissolve that terminal monopoly. Please God, if we had had this provision in the law when that case was tried, St. Louis would have broken the thralldom of 30 years. It is because courts take that kind of view that I am here to appeal for a law that we who represent the people and speak for them ought to enact.

I was, however, when interrupted by Senator OVERMAN, commenting on the good old Standard Oil Co. and on the rise in the value of its stocks. That decision did not make as much difference to the Standard Oil Co. for all practical purposes as it would if an individual defendant had been in court and it had been solemnly decreed that he must go to the barber shop and get shaved. The penalty amounted to no more than that. That institution still fixes the prices not only upon the oil that is consumed by the people, but it fixes the price upon all the oil that the Almighty stored beneath the surface of the earth to light the feet of the shadowy hosts who shall march across this "bank of time" in the next thousand years.

#### TOBACCO TRUST DISSOLUTION A FRAUD.

The American Tobacco Co.: That company was created out of a vast number of institutions. It built itself up by practices that were brutal and cruel and criminal. It struck down and destroyed as remorselessly and with as little feeling as does one of the great guns of the Kaiser when it hurls its 2,000-pound missile, loaded with explosives, against a fortress. It took great men and wealthy men in its powerful grip and crushed them as easily as a giant can crush the infant child.

I had an old friend who, by shrewd investment, by the practice of economy, and by careful attention to business, had accumulated a fortune that was supposed to reach something like a million and a half dollars. Notice was served upon him by the trust to surrender. He had the temerity to refuse. In a few months' time the iron bands were tightened here and tightened there until, in order to save himself, he sacrificed something like a million dollars of his property and surrendered, glad to escape with part of his fortune.

These mighty combinations go into communities where there are not little men, but where there are men of great affairs, and strike them down as coldly, as criminally, as does a murderer who, from the dark, strikes an unsuspecting victim. Power like that is too dangerous to be lodged in the hands of any one concern.

The Tobacco Trust was at last brought to the bar of justice. It came with the insolent swagger of the bully who thinks he owns the court, the sheriff, and the jury. But the storm was

rising; popular opinion was making itself felt even in the citadels of the mighty. It appeared at last possible to put the iniquity of this concern into the balances of justice and obtain a righteous decision. Long and fearsome was the struggle. The legal athletes battled back and forth in the forum of the court, but at last the clock of time struck the hour of judgment. A judgment was rendered dividing this trust, which was a combination of 250 concerns, into 14 corporations which permitted common-stock ownership; and, as there was common-stock ownership, of course there was common control. Common-stock ownership is the vital bond that binds these corporations together as the attachment of flesh and blood and skin bound together the Siamese twins from birth to death. After it had been dissolved the stock of the company rose from \$390 to \$529 per share in a single day.

Why was that? Let me tell you. Until that decree was entered there was always the possibility that the law might be enforced; that some day and somehow, in the providence of God, that institution would be brought before a judge who would strike it down. Even before the case was begun shrewd investors knew that its practices were illegal and that impending over it always was the threat and possibility of punishment and dissolution. But when a decree had been rendered that did not in any way injure the trust, that still left it able to dominate the commercial world, the danger was past. The decree of dissolution was, of course, at the same time a bar to any further prosecution. It was a sort of perpetual corporate franchise granted by the court, the terms and conditions of which were fixed in the decree, and so fixed that the institution was as powerful after the decree as it was before. No longer was there any danger of prosecution. It was all ended. The Government of the United States, desiring to prosecute to-day, must begin at that decree, and can not go back of it for a single potential fact or base upon such fact a judgment hereafter to be rendered. Therefore the stock of the Tobacco Trust went up in the markets of Wall Street.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. REED. I do.

Mr. WALSH. I desire to inquire of the Senator from Missouri if it is his view that a judgment in a civil action against a trust under the Sherman Antitrust Act is a bar to a criminal prosecution either against the corporation or against its officers?

Mr. REED. I am not speaking of that; I am speaking about a civil action; that the judgment in the civil case having been rendered and having been complied with—

Mr. WALSH. No other civil action could be prosecuted.

Mr. REED. No other civil action could be brought.

Mr. WALSH. But the Senator does not contend, as I understand him, that the Standard Oil Co., its directors, or trust magnates, may not be prosecuted even yet under the criminal provisions of the law?

Mr. REED. Possibly they might if the conferees had not been so busy. We put in a section extending the statute of limitation to six years, but it disappeared in conference. The three-year statute has run against nearly all of these enterprising buccaners to whom I am referring.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I desire to inquire of the Senator further, then, if the statute has run, is it his view that we could institute a prosecution even if the statute of limitations were subsequently extended?

Mr. REED. I do not think we could if it has actually run. When I said "has run," I perhaps ought to have said "has run or is about to run."

Mr. WALSH. Then, I desire to inquire of the Senator whether the criminal court is not still open to the Government, and whether those remedies are not available, notwithstanding the judgment which has been rendered in the civil action?

Mr. REED. The Senator means for the enforcement of criminal penalties?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. REED. Undoubtedly the civil judgment is not a bar to criminal prosecution.

Mr. WALSH. I am glad the Senator takes that view of it.

Mr. REED. If the criminal prosecution is not barred by the statute of limitations, it may still go on; but, Mr. President, while that is true, that does not by so much as one jot or tittle take from the force of my argument, if it have any force, that there should be a law demanding a civil judgment that will restore conditions as they were before the trust was organized.

Mr. President, as part of my remarks, I desire to have incorporated into the Record, without reading, a short article pertinent to the matter to which I have just been referring, from

the Literary Digest of June 15, 1912, under the title "Dissolved trusts under scrutiny."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The article referred to is as follows:

#### DISSOLVED TRUSTS UNDER SCRUTINY.

A few months ago the public learned, to its amazement, that the securities of the various companies which had made up the Standard Oil and Tobacco Trusts represented on the stock market a value many millions in excess of the rating of those trusts before their dissolution. Now, two cases before the courts give rise to the curious suspicion that the oil and tobacco octopi are not only richer since their disintegration, but more active, more predatory, and more powerful. In one of these cases the litigation had its beginning in the refusal of Henry Clay Pierce, president of the Waters-Pierce Oil Co., to count the proxies offered in behalf of the Standard Oil interests, although those proxies represented a majority of the Waters-Pierce stock. In defense, Mr. Pierce argues that the alleged dissolution of Standard Oil has not really robbed the trust of any of its potentialities, and that if his company recognizes the Standard Oil control it will lose its charter in Missouri, its home State. In the course of the proceedings it has been testified that the secret daily meetings of the directors of the Oil Trust did not cease after the dissolution, but are still held every day in room 1500 at 26 Broadway. And it is contended by the Pierce interests that the same group who controlled the subsidiaries through the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey are still in control of all of them, and are trying to control the Waters-Pierce Co., in violation of the Supreme Court's decree and of the mandates of the Missouri courts.

As a witness John D. Rockefeller testified that he had "given no attention at all" to the matter of reorganizing the companies in accordance with the dissolution decree, but when Samuel Untermyer asked, "then how do you know whether it is being managed so as to cut loose and hold tight?" he answered with heat that "there has been no such thing as cutting loose and holding tight." The effect of his testimony is thus summarized in the news columns of the New York Times:

"Although Mr. Rockefeller parried almost every thrust from Mr. Untermyer, and usually slipped away from committing himself, the general effect of his testimony was to show that the men who formerly dominated the trust—and Mr. Rockefeller didn't hesitate to refer to it as a trust—were the men who decided what individuals should take charge of the subsidiary companies after they had been 'liberated,' as he expressed it."

"No more elusive, subtle, noncommittal, impossible witness ever took the stand," exclaims the New York American, which quotes the opinion of the London Economist that "there are more brains behind the Standard Oil 'crowd' than there are behind the whole United States Government at Washington." Mr. Rockefeller's very evasions, thinks the chief counsel for the Waters-Pierce contestants, will convince the public that the Standard Oil reorganization has not been all that it pretends to be. And in the New York Herald we read:

"The Federal authorities made their best efforts and operated under the most stringent laws on the books to abolish this fattest of trusts. The result was a paper victory for the people. The real victory, it is now admitted by Mr. Rockefeller, was won by the oil company, which is run in practically the same old way, by the same old men, with profits even greater than formerly."

A lawyer connected with this case estimates "from fairly exhaustive data," we read in the New York World, that Mr. Rockefeller's fortune now amounts to \$900,000,000, and that it has increased \$100,000,000 since the dissolution of Standard Oil.

The New York Evening Journal notes that before its dissolution the Standard Oil Trust was worth "just about \$321,000,000 less than it is worth now," and it goes on to say:

"When you compel a Tobacco Trust or a Standard Oil Trust to dissolve, what do you do?"

"You give the insiders a chance to make millions at the expense of innocent stockholders."

"Some of these separate Standard Oil concerns have jumped up to the most phenomenal prices of \$2,000 and \$3,000, and even \$6,500 a share."

"Can't you imagine which particular individuals knew what would happen?"

"Don't you know that the insiders, the men who control the trust, knew perfectly well that one particular subsidiary concern was valuable and that another particular concern was running at a loss or small profit?"

"As long as the trust was run all as one concern the stockholders of the trust got his part of the profit from everything."

"When you divide it up you find a few big, rich men holding the valuable parts in their hands and getting all the profit, and the poor, silly fools—the public—holding in their little pockets the worthless stuff."

Turning to the litigation which has dragged the Tobacco Trust again into the limelight beside the Standard Oil octopus, we read that it is a suit brought by an independent tobacco concern, E. Locker & Co., against the American Tobacco Co., the Liggett & Myers Tobacco Co., and the P. Lorillard Co. The petition claims that despite the dissolution decree, these companies are doing business virtually as the same old Tobacco Trust and employing the same old methods to crush independent dealers.

Referring ironically to the efforts of the officers of the companies which once made up the trust to restore competition between these companies, the petition says:

"One of the means employed by them in their earnest efforts to restore so-called competition is for four of the big companies to come into a territory, apparently to compete with each other, but in reality to attack the common enemy—that is, the independent manufacturer—simultaneously and from all sides, so that whereas the independent tobacco people had a fighting chance before when attacked by one trust, their annihilation is now a matter of certainty, for who can withstand a simultaneous attack of four trusts operating in concert and at the same time? And so there have been more failures of independent tobacco jobbers in this city within the last few months, since these new companies have started out to restore competition, than there have been in so many years."

Mr. REED. I also desire to incorporate in my remarks an article from the Literary Digest of April 4, 1914, entitled "Steel and oil prosperity."



The VICE PRESIDENT. There being no objection, it is so ordered.

The article referred to is as follows:

A sign of the times with Standard Oil, we are informed, is that while many Wall Street brokers have been laying off employees, dealers in Standard Oil subsidiary shares have in some offices doubled their pay roll and keep their people busy until 9 in the evening. Since the dissolution of the Standard Oil Co. two years ago these shareholders of the old New Jersey company, says the Wall Street Journal, who have held onto all their fractions, have benefited during this period of the appreciation in the market value of the companies' shares and of the cash dividends paid, and this paper adds:

"These indicate a total profit in Standard Oil shares since the dissolution of at least 115 per cent. On December 15, 1911, Standard Oil stock, which included the New Jersey company, and all subsidiaries, sold at \$640 a share, while to-day these shares are quoted around \$1,230, an increase of \$590 a share, or over 90 per cent. Cash dividends paid by the Standard Oil Co. during the past two years have aggregated more than \$160,000,000, equivalent to over 160 per cent on the capital stock of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, and equivalent to over 25 per cent on the investment in the old shares at \$640.

"A review of the 34 companies included in the Standard Oil group for 1913, the second year of restored competition between these companies under the watchful eye of the Washington Government, discloses a state of prosperity probably unequaled by any other group of companies in the United States."

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I have never posed as a trust buster; I have never posed as the enemy of capital. My interest in this subject springs from no such narrow ground. Ever since we have had civilization there have been two different philosophies. One of them has asserted that it is the God-given right of a few men to control in affairs of government, and that God-given right has always been translated into the privilege of the few to plunder the many. It was for centuries contended that only a select few were sufficiently intelligent to conduct affairs of government, and that they alone could protect the people against their own foolishness. The idea that all of the people were possessed of natural rights was scorned by the philosophers and leaders and teachers of the world through thousands of years.

Governments granted patents of monopoly entitling certain favored individuals to enjoy the exclusive privileges of trade. Those gentlemen always used the privilege to extort the last possible penny from the masses of the people. It was thought that trade could not exist and prosper if it were not carried on under the protecting ægis of the Government. But a new thought was born in the world: Some wild dreamer conceived the idea that if you gave everybody a chance the sum total of good that would result would be greater than if you gave only a few men a chance. Accordingly we wrote it into our creed, that all men were created free and equal, and that all are entitled to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. We construed "liberty" to mean not merely the right to walk upon the streets of cities or through the lanes of the country, but liberty to embark in business, to engage in commerce, to solve for one's self the problem of one's own happiness and success. We came to the conclusion, too, that there could be no liberty in commerce if the entire field of business was controlled in a few hands; that to say to a man, "You have a right to engage in business," but at the same time to create or permit a condition which made engaging in business an impossibility, was simply to tickle his ear with a delusive phrase while denying to his soul the substances of liberty.

So we began enacting legislation calculated to produce a condition which would leave open for all men, big and little, the opportunity to engage in the affairs of life. The man who holds to that doctrine is not the enemy of business; he is the friend of business.

The nation that first drove from the ocean the pirate craft was the best friend of commerce, for it made possible the voyage of all vessels, big and little, bearing an honest cargo. The Government that says to men, "You shall not build monopoly upon the ruins of the hopes and aspirations and fortunes of the millions" is not an enemy of business; it is the friend of business in the broader sense. It opens the field of enterprise so that all men may there enter and lay the foundations not only of their own private fortunes, but of the fortunes of their country.

After 24 years of trial of the Sherman Act, we have found in the school of experience that there are defects in our antitrust legislation. We entered upon the present attempt at amendment with the idea that we could reach much of the evil of monopoly by condemning its favorite practices. That thus we could provide a short cut to their vitals. We thought it would be easy to prove a particular practice and to impose a swift and speedy penalty. We end by taking every penal provision out of the trust sections of this bill. We end by providing a smooth and easy road which may be traveled through the years, until finally a commission shall issue an innocuous, nonenforceable decree, a decree that can be vitalized only by being affirmed

by a court. At the conclusion of all the litigation we propose to impose no penalty, levy no fine, send no one to jail, and we permit the culprit to preserve his swag!

This is the proud record we are writing. Against it I have for hours now protested, perhaps to deaf ears; but I shall, at least, have the satisfaction of knowing that every position I have taken is in accordance with the platforms of my party; with the declarations of the great leaders of my party; that every position I have taken here is a part of the warp and woof of Democracy.

It has been hinted more than said here this morning that we have reached a point where it is not safe to dissolve these great concerns; that by dissolving them we shall do more harm than good, and therefore we must touch them with gentle hands. If that be true, it can only be true because monopoly is a beneficent thing; and if monopoly be a beneficent thing, then let us have done with the false pretense that it is to be exterminated.

#### THE FIRST MONOPOLY.

I deny, sir, that monopoly is a good thing. There can be no monopoly that is not built upon the grave of human hopes. There can be no monopoly that has not crushed out the life and the prosperity of individuals and of communities. There never has been a good monopoly, and there never will be. Until you can find a beneficent murderer, or a Christian burglar, or a kind-hearted assassin, you will not find a good monopoly. Monopoly is born of greed; it is cradled in avarice; its soul is cupidity. There never was a monopoly created in this world but that the man who created it did so in order that he might take advantage of the necessities of his fellow man. Always and forever the vision before the eye of the monopolist is so to control a prime necessity of life that he may be able to compel the people to pay his price. His object is not to compete in the market, but to sell to hungry mouths at the price hunger is willing to pay.

It has been so from the first. The earliest monopoly of which we have record was in the land of Egypt. There were seven fat years. The world laughed with glorious harvests. The Valley of the Nile was rich in fruitful crops. Vast fields of grain stretched away like shoreless yellow seas. The king learned that there were to be seven years of famine, and so, at the cheap prices of the hour he gathered into vast granaries the immeasurable crops of corn. He awaited the hour when the people must buy. Then came the years of drought. The hot sun shot its fiery arrows into the burning soil. The earth opened its mouth and cried for water. Nature refused to produce her fruitage.

Then came the brown hosts of Egypt—the women whose sons and brothers had died to give glory to the Empire—the soldiers upon whose stout shields had been borne to a thousand victories the imperial monopolist.

With parched lips they cried, "Give us corn, O Pharaoh." Then spake the king: "Bring hither your silver and your gold." They piled it in shining heaps at the feet of the monster they had worshiped as a god.

Again they cried, "O Pharaoh, give us corn lest we perish." The merciless reply came, "Bring hither your flocks and your herds." They drove the lowing kine through the dusty valley of the Nile and surrendered them to the tyrant's insatiate greed.

Once again came the piteous appeal, "Give us corn, O Pharaoh, for we die of hunger." He looked upon them; the lips of want were drawn back from the teeth of starvation; their eyes were bloodshot from the agony of hunger; the flesh had fallen from their bones. They crouched before him, a skeleton army upon which death had cast his ashen mark. Pharaoh knew the time was ripe to enslave the people, and he said: "Bring hither your sons and your daughters, your manservants and your maidservants." When the ancient monopolist had concluded that hellish bargain he owned all of the lands, and all of the cattle, and all of the gold, and all of the silver, and all of the bodies of the countless hosts of the empire of Egypt. Five hundred years afterwards the Sacred Writer declared "the people are slaves even unto this day."

Such is the story of the first monopolist of whom we have record in history. Every man who has since gathered the necessities of life, cornered the means of production, or combined and combined until he dominated the commercial world has been inspired by the same motives, has pursued the same methods, and is no better than was the heathen king of 4,000 years ago.

We are dealing with that century-old question to-day. The American people are looking on and saying, "Give us bread," and we are responding, "We will give you this stone. We will not harass or annoy these gentlemen who build monopolies. We will deal gently with them. In fact, we are a little afraid

to dissolve them at all. We dare thus to answer in the name of Democracy and reform!"

What change has come over the spirit of our dreams? Where now are the soldiers of Democracy who said, "Lead us to the charge"? Where now the bold and dauntless orators who on a thousand platforms and a hundred thousand stumps declared to the people of the land, "Open to Democracy the doors of the citadel, and we will expel the rogues. Give us the key of the temple, and"—in imitation of the Savior 1,900 years ago—"we will make a scourge of cords and drive the money-changers from the high places of the land"? Your scourge of cords is but a wisp of straw, to which you set the match, that even it shall be turned to ashes which may be blown about by idle winds.

Mr. President, I have too long wearied the Senate. I thank the Senate for its attention.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I ask unanimous consent to take up House joint resolution 241, for the appointment of four members of the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator that I know very little about that bill; but the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] has asked to be present when the bill is considered. I understand that he will be in the city either tomorrow or next day, and I ask the Senator to let the bill go over until the Senator from Ohio returns.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I will not insist, Mr. President, though I understood when the matter was first broached that the Senator from Ohio wanted to be present, and that when it was taken up he was present, and he did not ask to be present the next time it was considered. If the Senator insists, however, of course I do not want to take it up in the absence of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. SMOOT. No; I do not want it taken up in the absence of the Senator from Ohio.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. STERLING. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Kern	O'Gorman	Shields
Bankhead	Lane	Overman	Smoot
Bryan	Lee, Md.	Page	Sterling
Chamberlain	Lewis	Perkins	Swanson
Chilton	Martin, Va.	Poin Dexter	Thompson
Culberson	Martine, N. J.	Reed	Thornton
Fletcher	Myers	Robinson	Vardaman
Hitchcock	Nelson	Shafroth	West
Jones	Norris	Sheppard	

Mr. LEWIS. I wish to announce that the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. LEA] is detained from the Chamber by official business at one of the departments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHAMBERLAIN in the chair). Thirty-five Senators have answered to their names. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the names of absentees.

The Secretary called the names of absent Senators, and Mr. WARREN answered to his name when called.

Mr. LEE of Maryland. I am requested to state that the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. LEA] is absent from the Senate on public business.

Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. STONE, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. GORE, and Mr. JOHNSON entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

After a little delay Mr. SHIVELY, Mr. WHITE, Mr. WALSH, Mr. SMITH of Maryland, Mr. McCUMBER, and Mr. SMITH of Georgia entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Forty-nine Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

Mr. KERN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the Senator yield for a moment that I may submit a request for unanimous consent?

Mr. KERN. Does the Senator wish to have me yield for any considerable length of time?

Mr. NORRIS. No; I wish to ask unanimous consent to have matter printed in the RECORD, if the Senator will yield.

Mr. KERN. I yield for that purpose.

#### PROPOSED CONSTITUTION FOR AN INTERNATIONAL GOVERNMENT.

Mr. NORRIS. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a proposed constitution for an international government by Dr. Taylor, editor of the Medical World, together with some comments made by Dr. Taylor on it. I do not desire, however, to say by this action that I approve of everything in the consti-

tution, neither does Dr. Taylor offer the constitution as a perfected instrument, but for the purpose of getting discussion and general debate on the subject of international peace. He conceives this to be an opportune time to offer some suggestions in regard to what he believes may bring that about. In carrying out that idea I desire to have it printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

#### PROPOSED CONSTITUTION FOR AN INTERNATIONAL GOVERNMENT.

##### PREAMBLE.

In order to prevent war, abolish national armaments (except limited police provisions to preserve internal peace, law, and order), diminish national prejudices, and to promote peace, prosperity, happiness, and the general welfare, we, the people of the nations which shall agree to this compact, as signified by affirmative popular vote after thorough discussion and authoritative submission, do ordain and establish this inviolable instrument, and proclaim it as a sign and evidence of a higher civilization than any that the human race has heretofore attained.

##### ARTICLE 1.

All local governmental authority shall remain as at present constituted or as may hereafter be legally constituted within the constituent nations, except as necessarily modified by this constitution.

##### ARTICLE 2.

All general governmental authority shall be given, and is hereby given, to two bodies, a senate and a representat, composed as provided herein, which shall constitute the international government. But the constituent nations and the people therein reserve the right of initiative, referendum, and recall, as shall be provided.

##### ARTICLE 3.

1. The senate shall consist of three members from each constituent nation, and an additional member for each 50,000,000 population and (or) major fraction thereof in any constituent nation, not including colonial possessions.

2. The international senators shall be chosen by the legislative authority of each constituent nation, in joint session if such authority be lodged in two bodies.

3. The regular length of term for international senators shall be seven years, but succession shall be so arranged that a change of not more than one-third of the body shall be made in any one calendar year.

4. The compensation of international senators shall be \$15,000 per year, with 10 cents per mile for the necessary traveling distance from the home of each senator to the place of meeting and return once per year.

##### ARTICLE 4.

1. The representat shall consist of a representative for each 5,000,000 population and major fraction thereof in each constituent nation, not including colonial possessions, popularly elected by the regular voters in each constituent nation according to regulations to be established by the popular representative body or "lower house" in each constituent nation; but each constituent nation shall have at least one such representative.

2. The regular length of term for representatives shall be three years, and the term of not more than one-half of the membership of this body shall expire in one calendar year.

3. The compensation of representatives shall be \$10,000 per year, with the same mileage as that allowed for senators.

##### ARTICLE 5.

1. The senate shall be in constant session except for one permissible recess in any calendar year not to exceed 30 consecutive days, counting Sundays. During such recess a committee of at least three members shall remain on duty, with such discretionary power as may be granted by the senate. Longer or additional vacations may be granted to individual members by majority vote of the senate, but not more than one-fourth of the body may be absent from duty at any time except during a recess.

2. The representat shall have annual sessions, and it shall determine the time of convening and length of sessions, but extraordinary sessions of the representat may be called by a two-thirds vote of the senate.

##### ARTICLE 6.

1. The senate and representat shall each select its president and other officers, and shall determine the duties, powers, and compensation of the same. The president of each body shall be a member, but the other officers need not be members. Each body shall determine its own rules.

2. The credentials of membership of each body shall be determined by a court to be designated or established by both bodies in joint session. But until such court is designated or established, each body may judge the credentials of its own members.

##### ARTICLE 7.

Senators and representatives shall be subject to recall at any time after six months' incumbency in office by the constituencies represented, respectively. The process of recall may be established by the different constituencies represented; but if not so established within three years after the establishment of this constitution the senate shall establish a process of recall for senators, and the representat for representatives, to be applied in constituencies in which no process of recall has been established, until said constituencies shall establish a process of recall.

##### ARTICLE 8.

1. Powers of the international government: The government hereby established shall acquire, possess, and have full authority over all military and naval establishments in the signatory nations. This shall mean all ships of war, fortifications of all kinds, artillery for land and sea, arms of all kinds for both cavalry and infantry, ammunition and military stores of all kinds, and all military apparatus for navigating the air. Police provisions for the maintenance of internal peace and order shall be permitted to the constituent nations; but the total strength of the same may be limited by the international government. Militia may be permitted to the constituent nations, but its regulation and control must primarily reside in the international government.

2. A standing army and navy shall be maintained by this government sufficient to maintain peace among the constituent nations and to protect any and all the constituent nations from outside aggression.



3. All international relations of a political nature among the signatory nations shall be under the entire control of this government, which shall, in its discretion, deal with them directly, or establish a court for this purpose.

4. Declaration of war against, or the conclusion of peace with, any power foreign to this international government shall be the exclusive province of this government as herein constituted.

5. This government shall be supported by revenue raised by its own authority from individuals or private corporations, and not by assessment of the constituent nations. Taxes may be laid in any manner that the wisdom of the government may devise, but the method or methods adopted shall be applied uniformly in all the nations constituting the international government.

6. Commerce may be regulated among the constituent nations of this government, and between this government as a whole or any one or more of its constituent nations, and any one or more nations foreign to this government, by this government as herein constituted.

7. An international coinage system may be proposed by this government to its constituent nations, and it may put the same into operation among those constituent nations assenting to the plan.

8. Each constituent nation shall have full control of education and language within its boundaries; but the government may make regulations as to the language or languages to be used orally among its individual members. All public documents must be published in the legal language of each constituent nation for use in each nation.

9. All treaties, either between constituent nations or between a constituent nation and a nation foreign to this government, may be revised by the senate.

#### ARTICLE 9.

1. The government shall make international laws for the purposes set forth in this instrument.

2. The business of the senate and representat shall be coordinated by a coordinating committee consisting of three members elected from and by each house in a manner to best secure a fair representation of varying sentiments or factions, and one member to be appointed by the highest court established by the government, and this member may be a member of said court, but not a member of either house; and until such court shall be established, the seventh member of the coordinating committee shall be elected by a majority vote of both houses in joint session.

3. This coordinating committee shall have authority over the sequence of consideration and voting upon bills in both houses, to the effect that neither house shall neglect bills passed by the other house.

4. A quorum of either house shall be a majority of its members.

5. Ordinary bills shall become laws upon passage by both houses by a majority of members present, and the signature of the president of each house.

6. All revenue bills shall originate in the representat; but they may be amended by the senate if said amendments are acceptable to the representat. Any revenue bill, when rejected by the senate, if passed by a two-thirds vote of the entire membership of the representat twice, the votings to be separated by an interval of at least 30 diurnal days, including Sundays, shall become law.

#### ARTICLE 10.

The chief administrative branch is the senate. Additional administrative provisions may be established by law. Additional administrative officers shall be proposed by the senate and confirmed by the representat. They shall be under the direction and control of the senate, and subject to dismissal by a majority vote of that body; but they shall be subject to recall by a two-thirds vote of the entire membership of the representat.

#### ARTICLE 11.

At the first general election for the election of the representat after this constitution shall have been in operation 10 consecutive years, the senate and representat shall, by majority vote of each, submit to the popular electorate a system of popular initiative and referendum, both for ordinary general legislation and also for constitutional amendment, which shall be deemed a part of this constitution if favored by a majority of the voters voting thereon in a majority of the constituent nations. If such majority shall also constitute a majority of the sum total of all the votes cast thereon in all the constituent nations.

#### ARTICLE 12.

1. This constitution may be amended, in addition to the provision in the previous article, as follows:

Upon demand of the senate and representat, by majority vote of each, or by a two-thirds vote of either the senate or representat on two separate occasions, separated by a period of not less than two years nor more than five years, any proposed amendment of this constitution shall be submitted to the electorate at the next election of the representat, but it shall be passed and made a part of public records not less than one year previous to said election; and said amendment shall be considered adopted and made a part of this constitution if favored by a three-fifths majority of all the votes cast thereon in three-fifths of the constituent nations, if such majority also constitute a three-fifths majority of the sum total of all the votes cast thereon in all the constituent nations.

2. Provisions shall be made by law for informing voters concerning measures or constitutional amendments submitted to popular vote.

#### COMMENTS BY DR. TAYLOR.

One of the "bones of contention" in this constitution will be the composition of the senate, as it was in our convention in Philadelphia in 1787. The problem was a new one then. The small States contended for equal representation in the Senate, while the large States contended for representation according to population. This question came near breaking up the convention. Finally the large States yielded, as it was argued, the lower House was based on population. Really, the line of difference is that the Senate represents the State governments, while the House represents the people. That is the idea in the above proposed constitution—that the senate shall represent the government. In 1787 our State governments wanted representation as such, as the State idea was then dominant, the national idea not being developed much at that time. But the recent amendment providing for popular election of United States Senators changes somewhat the original idea. United States Senators will henceforth represent the people of their States rather than the State government.

In any international constitutional convention this same question would arise, and at the present time, governments, as such, would demand representation, just as our States demanded representation, and equal representation, as such. In the course of years, under such a constitution, particularly after free diffusion of the people from one

nation into another, which as we have seen takes place to a considerable extent under the present restrictions, the local national feeling would become much less than it is at present. The State feeling among us has almost entirely disappeared.

One danger might be that some of the empires, as Germany, would wish to break up and claim representation in the senate for each constituent part, and thus control the entire senate. This would have to be guarded against. And I think that rather more representation in the senate according to population would be demanded than I have provided for, as France, for example, would want more senators than Holland or Norway. The problem would be to keep the senate small, and yet satisfy the small nations. A better plan than I have presented for this could doubtless be devised. My plan is "the first dash," and I add these comments for modification.

Perhaps a better way to constitute the senate than the one given above would be by the Norwegian plan for constituting the upper house; that is, provide that the representat select the senate from its own members. In this way the senate could be strictly limited in numbers, and there would be no complaint of excess of representation of the smaller nations in the senate. Provision could easily be made that one-third of the senate pass out of office and renewed each second year. It might be desirable occasionally to make a selection for the senate outside of the representat. The constitution might grant permission to the effect that one-third of the senate may be constituted from outside of the membership of the representat.

The giving up of armies and armaments would be "a bitter pill" to the governmental authorities of some nations, but they would have to yield to this absolute necessity. The first step for peace among people who want to fight is to disarm them; and if all are disarmed they are on as equal a footing as if all were armed to the utmost, only they could not do much harm when disarmed—and the first object of an international government would be to put a permanent stop to the waste, destruction, and horrors of war. And we want to put a stop to the contention that battleships make for peace. They would if one nation were sufficiently strong to dominate the whole world; but that would be peace only on the terms of that one nation. We want to make one power sufficiently strong to dominate the whole world, but we want that to be an international power, controlled by an international government constituted justly to all concerned. Then battleships, owned and directed by that government, would make for peace, both among the constituent nations and between the "union" and the outside world, by protecting the constituent nations from both internal and external aggression.

The only way to secure and certainly preserve the world's peace is by some such combination of nations, the aggregate of which would be sufficiently strong to successfully meet aggression by the rest of the world, the internal peace being secured by disarmament of the constituent nations, and placing all armaments under the control of the international government, for the preservation of internal peace and protection from external aggression.

This is a large subject, but we must take it up some time, and just now it is forced upon us. Its importance overshadows everything else. Shall we shirk or face it? The most important task that humanity has before it is the permanent prevention of war. This should be done in a way in which the support of armaments shall be reduced to the minimum, in order to reduce the burden. A plan by which the armaments of the constituent nations shall be united and maintained only to the point of domination over outside opposition would secure this minimum, which would be reduced as new nations would come into the plan, until it would disappear entirely. The main object of war prevention being secured, many other advantages would come along in the wake of co-operation along this line, which would be far-reaching beyond our present conception.

#### THE COPPER INDUSTRY.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I have just received a telegram from the International Metals Selling Co., of 42 Broadway, New York, which I desire to read into the RECORD:

New York, September 29, 1914.

Hon. REED SMOOT, Washington, D. C.:

British Government's interference copper shipments, neutral bottoms, Rotterdam, seriously endangers copper industry this country. Appeal to you, as Senator representing large copper industry, make representations State Department stop unreasonable interference our neutral trade. British royal proclamation, Second Hague Conference stipulations, American War Risk Bureau do not mention copper as even conditional contraband. Unless shipment copper to neutrals can be kept open, afraid further reduction production inevitable.

INTERNATIONAL METALS SELLING CO.,  
42 Broadway.

Mr. President, I read this telegram into the RECORD at this time and express the hope that everything will be done by the State Department to prevent interference with copper shipments in neutral bottoms, and thus allow the copper industry of this country to maintain the present number of men employed, which is only about one-half of the usual number. If interference is allowed with the shipments into neutral countries and in neutral bottoms, it will mean the total suspension of the copper industry of this country.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. KERN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House agrees to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 18752) to amend section 98 of an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911.

The message also announced that the House disapproves to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 14233) to provide

for the leasing of coal lands in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes, asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. FERRIS, Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois, and Mr. LENROOT managers at the conference on the part of the House.

#### ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

S. 657. An act to authorize the reservation of public lands for country parks and community centers within reclamation projects, and for other purposes;

S. 3550. An act ratifying the establishment of the boundary line between the States of Connecticut and Massachusetts;

S. 5798. An act authorizing the health officer of the District of Columbia to issue a permit for the removal of the remains of the late Earl A. Bancroft from Glenwood Cemetery, District of Columbia, to Mantorville, Minn.;

H. J. Res. 335. Joint resolution to amend an act entitled "An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war," approved July 21, 1914;

H. J. Res. 339. Joint resolution to correct an error in H. R. 12914; and

H. J. Res. 342. Joint resolution to correct an error in H. R. 12914.

#### BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. PAGE (for Mr. DILLINGHAM):

A bill (S. 6551) granting a pension to Abbie Holbrook (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. O'GORMAN:

A bill (S. 6552) for the relief of Samuel A. Russel; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Joint resolution (S. J. Res. 189) authorizing the Secretary of War to proceed with the improvement of East River and Hell Gate, N. Y.; to the Committee on Commerce.

#### ALASKA COAL LANDS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 14233) to provide for the leasing of coal land in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. MYERS. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the conference asked for by the House, the conferees on the part of the Senate to be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. MYERS, Mr. PITTMAN, and Mr. SMOOT conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### RECESS.

Mr. KERN. I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 17 minutes p. m., Tuesday, September 29, 1914) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Wednesday, September 30, 1914, at 11 o'clock a. m.

#### NOMINATIONS.

*Executive nominations received by the Senate September 29 (legislative day of September 28), 1914.*

##### UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE.

Augustus N. Hand, of New York City, to be United States district judge, southern district of New York, vice George C. Holt, resigned.

ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Walter I. McCoy, of East Orange, N. J., to be associate justice of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, vice Job Barnard, resigned.

##### REGISTER OF THE LAND OFFICE.

Thomas Jones, of Vale, Oreg., to be register of the land office at Vale, Oreg., vice Bruce R. Kester, term expired.

##### SURVEYOR OF CUSTOMS.

Cyrus W. Davis, of Waterville, Me., to be surveyor of customs in customs collection district No. 1, in place of Joshua L. Chamberlain, deceased.

#### PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

##### INFANTRY ARM.

Second Lieut. Edward S. Hayes, Twenty-eighth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from August 3, 1914, vice First Lieut. James Regan, Ninth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Simon B. Buckner, jr., Ninth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from August 5, 1914, vice First Lieut. Gilbert M. Allen, Nineteenth Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Charles H. Bouesteel, Twelfth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from September 11, 1914, vice First Lieut. John Randolph, Twenty-third Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Thomas J. Johnson, Ninth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from September 13, 1914, vice First Lieut. Harry Graham, Twenty-second Infantry, promoted.

Second Lieut. Robert H. Fletcher, jr., Eighth Infantry, to be first lieutenant from September 14, 1914, vice First Lieut. Jubal A. Early, Twentieth Infantry, who died September 13, 1914.

#### PROMOTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY.

Ensign Stuart S. Brown to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy from the 5th day of June, 1914.

Talmadge Wilson, a citizen of Georgia, to be an assistant surgeon in the Medical Reserve Corps of the Navy from the 12th day of September, 1914.

John D. Target, a citizen of Pennsylvania, to be an assistant surgeon in the Medical Reserve Corps of the Navy from the 19th day of September, 1914.

Walter W. Cress, a citizen of California, to be an assistant surgeon in the Medical Reserve Corps of the Navy from the 19th day of September, 1914.

Boatswain Thomas James to be a chief boatswain in the Navy from the 31st day of January, 1913.

#### POSTMASTERS.

##### ALABAMA.

C. N. Parnell to be postmaster at Maplesville, Ala., in place of Ralph Callaway, resigned.

##### GEORGIA.

George G. Brinson to be postmaster at Millen, Ga., in place of Albert S. Anderson, resigned.

Emma Pettis to be postmaster at Cave Spring, Ga., in place of Albert N. Tumlin, resigned.

##### IOWA.

William P. Coutts to be postmaster at Kellogg, Iowa, in place of Eugene J. Birchard, resigned.

Eugene F. Kieffer to be postmaster at Remsen, Iowa, in place of Louis H. Schulte, resigned.

Samuel B. Wesp to be postmaster at Fredericksburg, Iowa, in place of Milo L. Sherman, resigned.

##### KENTUCKY.

L. W. Springfield to be postmaster at Sebree, Ky., in place of Perry Westerfield. Incumbent's commission expired May 19, 1914.

##### MICHIGAN.

A. E. Millett to be postmaster at Armada, Mich., in place of Neil Mills, resigned.

##### MINNESOTA.

George W. Owens to be postmaster at Elmore, Minn., in place of Ole C. Enge, resigned.

##### MISSISSIPPI.

Edgar G. Harris to be postmaster at Laurel, Miss., in place of Asa A. Edwards, resigned.

##### MISSOURI.

J. Vance Bumbarger to be postmaster at Memphis, Mo., in place of De Witt Wagner, resigned.

##### NEBRASKA.

H. C. Letson to be postmaster at Red Cloud, Nebr., in place of Theodore C. Hacker, resigned.

##### NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Charles L. Bemis to be postmaster at Marlboro, N. H., in place of Charles L. Bemis. Incumbent's commission expired December 20, 1913.

##### NEW MEXICO.

Charles M. Samford to be postmaster at Hagerman, N. Mex., in place of Thomas B. Platt, resigned.



James L. Seligman to be postmaster at Santa Fe, N. Mex., in place of John Pflueger, removed.

## NEW YORK.

Harry A. Miller to be postmaster at Lestershire, N. Y., in place of Charles J. Quick. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1913.

Elbridge J. Stratton to be postmaster at Theresa, N. Y., in place of Emmons R. Stockwell. Incumbent's commission expired June 10, 1914.

George J. Webb to be postmaster at Salem, N. Y., in place of N. Austin Baker. Incumbent's commission expired December 16, 1912.

## NORTH DAKOTA.

Marjorie J. Bloom to be postmaster at Devils Lake, N. Dak., in place of Richard Daeley. Incumbent's commission expired March 11, 1914.

## OHIO.

Robert E. Sickinger to be postmaster at Milan, Ohio, in place of Levi Roscoe, resigned.

## OKLAHOMA.

John M. Jones to be postmaster at Hennessey, Okla., in place of Jabez A. Felt, resigned.

Preston S. Lester to be postmaster at McAlester, Okla., in place of Harry C. Clark, resigned.

## PENNSYLVANIA.

John Kehoe to be postmaster at Pittston, Pa., in place of Harold J. Mahon. Incumbent's commission expired March 31, 1914.

William A. Kessler to be postmaster at Homestead, Pa., in place of John Grein. Incumbent's commission expired June 24, 1914.

H. F. Sowers to be postmaster at Yatesboro, Pa., in place of William G. Miller. Incumbent's commission expired March 16, 1914.

## SOUTH DAKOTA.

Anton Koch to be postmaster at Isabel, S. Dak., in place of L. A. Wilson, resigned.

## TENNESSEE.

John B. Dow to be postmaster at Cookeville, Tenn., in place of S. D. Davis, resigned.

P. L. Harned to be postmaster at Clarksville, Tenn., in place of Roy P. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired May 31, 1914.

B. F. Grisham to be postmaster at Newbern, Tenn., in place of Norwell L. Scobey, resigned.

## TEXAS.

James M. Kennedy to be postmaster at Naples, Tex., in place of John C. Walker, removed.

G. C. Tiller to be postmaster at Carthage, Tex., in place of Samuel E. Morris. Incumbent's commission expired June 13, 1914.

## UTAH.

George Alva Zabriskie to be postmaster at Springville, Utah, in place of John F. Bringham. Incumbent's commission expired June 24, 1914.

## VIRGINIA.

Gordon E. Gilly to be postmaster at Big Stone Gap, Va., in place of Winfield S. Rose. Incumbent's commission expired February 21, 1914.

## WISCONSIN.

Dorothea Devlin to be postmaster at Loyal, Wis., in place of Albert F. Fuchs, resigned.

## CONFIRMATIONS.

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 29 (legislative day of September 28), 1914.*

## POSTMASTERS.

## ALABAMA.

John J. Dunlap, jr., Eutaw.

## TENNESSEE.

Mamie Erwin Perkins, Selmer.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, September 29, 1914.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord God, impart unto us wisdom, strength, courage, fortitude that we may walk worthy of the vocation whereunto Thou hast called us, and weave into the tissues of our being something noble, something worthy, and thus add to our moral character that we may know the purity of the divine life. In Christ Jesus, our Lord. Amen.

## AMENDING THE CONSTITUTION.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I introduced a resolution last July for a constitutional amendment, and as there seems to be no opportunity of getting time for discussion of measures not connected with the pending measure, I am forced to ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD which I have prepared upon that subject.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD upon a resolution which he has introduced submitting a constitutional amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

## ATLANTIC DEEP WATERWAY ASSOCIATION.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD an address delivered by my colleague, Hon. J. HAMPTON MOORE, of Pennsylvania, delivered at the recent session of the Atlantic Deep Waterway Association.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent to print a speech made by the Hon. J. HAMPTON MOORE, of Pennsylvania, in the deep-waterway project. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Journal was approved.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. FRENCH, by unanimous consent, was given leave of absence indefinitely, on account of illness.

## RESIGNATION OF A MEMBER.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following letter:

WASHINGTON, D. C., September 28, 1914.

HON. CHAMP CLARK,  
House of Representatives, Washington.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I am to-day writing as follows to the Hon. David I. Walsh, governor of Massachusetts:

HON. DAVID I. WALSH,  
Governor of Massachusetts.

MY DEAR GOVERNOR: President Wilson nominated me some weeks ago to be postmaster at Boston, in place of Hon. Edward C. Mansfield, resigned. Mr. Mansfield's resignation is effective at the close of business September 30, 1914. I shall become postmaster on the 1st of October, and therefore I herewith tender my resignation as Representative in Congress.

With great respect, I am,

Very truly, yours,

WILLIAM F. MURRAY.

May I ask you to lay this resignation of mine before the House?

With kindest regards, I am,

Very respectfully, yours,

WILLIAM F. MURRAY.

## LABOR.

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech by my colleague, the Hon. H. ROBERT FOWLER, made at Bicknell, Ind., on the 7th day of September, 1914, Labor Day.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by inserting in the RECORD a speech made by the Hon. H. ROBERT FOWLER at Bicknell, Ind., on Labor Day. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

## RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take up and consider the bill H. R. 13811, the river and harbor bill, together with the Senate amendment thereto.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent to take up for consideration the river and harbor bill with the Senate amendment. Is there objection?

Mr. CALLAWAY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I want to know how long it will take.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am under the impression that it will take all the afternoon if we get unanimous consent. My purpose is to give time for discussion, and I am informed that there are enough gentlemen asking for time to run throughout most of the afternoon.

Mr. CALLAWAY. I would not object if I knew that we could get through with the river and harbor bill to-day.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the gentleman from Texas that of course the river and harbor bill will be in order when the bill now under consideration is out of the way, because it will be privileged. But the bill as reported from the committee favors the Senate amendment, and only provides for the completion of the work now in progress. A number of contractors have had to stop work on account of the delay. Every day that the passage of the bill is delayed it is costing the Government money. If we are going to continue the work, the sooner they are furnished with the money the less it will cost the Government. I should like very much, if we can do so, to get the opportunity for the gentleman from Florida to present the bill to the House. Of course he has to give gentlemen opposed to it a reasonable opportunity to be heard, but I think it is possible to get through with it this afternoon if we take it up now. I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois whether there will be any opposition on that side that will probably run longer than this afternoon?

Mr. MANN. I should think that if the bill were taken up now, we might finish it this afternoon. But the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] knows more about the time than I do.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I think we could get through this afternoon. I think we want about two hours.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The gentleman means on that side?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Did the gentleman say two hours?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Two hours and a half, for I shall yield to two gentlemen on the other side; we will not divide on party lines.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Of course, we should want as much time on this side, although I think we could close up in two hours.

Mr. MANN. I think we could get through this afternoon.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Florida a question.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I will yield.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Is it not a fact that if we do not accept the bill as it passed the Senate we will get no river and harbor legislation at this session?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is decidedly my opinion.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Is it not a fact that confronting that situation there is no doubt about the consent of the House being given to the legislation?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I hope there is no doubt. As I see the situation, I think there is little doubt but that the House will accept the Senate amendment.

Mr. SLAYDEN. There is no doubt but that the House will accept what the newspapers describe as "pork" in the \$20,000,000 if they can not get \$53,000,000. I do not see why there should be a whole legislative day consumed in the discussion of what is already foreordained. I wish we could agree on a shorter time.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I will say that this thing has been going on six months. Six months ago the bill went to the Senate, and the discussion began two months afterwards when it was reported out of the committee.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Can not we agree on a shorter time?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not see how we can.

Mr. MANN. This is a more important matter than the Botanic Garden, and we spent two days on that.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think we ought to discuss this matter at some length, but, of course, not at too great a length.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the gentleman from Florida will yield to me a moment, I would like to ask the gentleman from Washington what proposals they have by way of amendment, after the general debate has been concluded?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Speaker, there will be one amendment submitted. There will be an amendment submitted to reduce the amount considerably from what it is now.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Could an agreement be made that after five hours of general debate any amendments may be offered during the debate and that at the end of five hours the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the Senate amendment and all amendments thereto and the House go to voting?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned, I think it would be perfectly fair to consider the Senate amendment in the House, instead of going into the Committee of the Whole, with the right to offer amendments during the five hours, and then that the previous question should be considered as ordered on the amendments and the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I think that would be satisfactory, because the only amendment I anticipate will be an amendment to reduce the amount.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Does the gentleman desire to have the amendments voted on when they are offered in the House or at the end of the general debate?

Mr. MANN. I think we better vote at the end, because otherwise it would be sure to run over.

Mr. BORLAND. Would not the bill be considered in the Committee of the Whole in any event?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The proposition is that it shall be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. MANN. That is a matter of unanimous consent.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I take it that there will be no desire to prolong matters.

Mr. BORLAND. The amendments would be disposed of in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. As I understand it, there is no desire to use any delaying tactics.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, if we considered it in the House, and there were a great many amendments offered, it might delay, but we want a roll call at least upon one amendment, or upon a motion to recommit, it does not make any difference which, for it would be in order in either case, but we want only one roll call.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Then I suggest to the gentleman from Florida that he ask unanimous consent for its consideration along that line.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill H. R. 13811, the river and harbor appropriation bill, with a Senate amendment thereto, and pending that I also suggest that we have five hours of general discussion.

Mr. MANN. I suggest to the gentleman that he make that a part of his request.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Very well; and that we have five hours of general discussion, or at least that the discussion end by 5 o'clock.

Mr. MANN. Make the request in this way: That the bill be taken up for consideration, together with the Senate amendment, that it be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole, with five hours of debate, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN] and one-half by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY], and that any gentleman having the floor shall be entitled to offer an amendment to be voted upon at the end of the general debate, and that at that time the previous question shall be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the river and harbor appropriation bill, including the Senate amendment thereto; that the debate thereon shall not exceed five hours; that it shall be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole; that any gentleman getting the floor shall have the right to offer an amendment; and that at the end of the general debate, if it stops short of five hours, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the Senate amendment, and all amendments thereto, and that all of these amendments offered by Members pending the debate shall be voted on at the conclusion of the debate, one half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Florida and the other half by the gentleman from Washington. Is there objection?

Mr. CALLAWAY. If that could be amended so as to make it four hours, I shall not object; but I do not believe that we can get through with five hours of debate in this day.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman from Texas yields, I would suggest that if we make it four hours of general debate, we would not be able to go ahead with anything else to-day.

Mr. CALLAWAY. I know; but I want this thing to be gotten off the boards to-day.

Mr. MANN. We can get it off the boards, I think, without any trouble to-day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Speaker, if that request is so modified as to make it extend no longer than this legislative day, I shall withdraw the objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will suggest to the gentleman that it is possible to extend the legislative day until the 4th of March.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Then, that it does not extend any longer than this calendar day.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I have no objection to that.



The SPEAKER. And also to be coupled with the request the provision that the discussion and disposition of the matter shall not extend beyond this calendar day. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MANN. Under the rule which was adopted with reference to the Philippine bill, and which seems to have cut out everything else, is Calendar Wednesday cut out?

The SPEAKER. No; it is not. The Chair would have ruled, if the point of order had been made, that it took a two-thirds vote of the House to pass that rule, provided it cut out Calendar Wednesday.

Mr. MANN. Then, Mr. Speaker, may I submit another inquiry, if it is in order? I noticed a while ago that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] had quite an audience in private conversation, and while I do not wish to intrude, I would like to inquire whether he has any statement which might be made to both sides of the House?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that if I can reach an understanding with this side of the House about one particular bill, I will be glad to submit a proposition to him and his side of the House to make a pact that will let Members go home. I hope to be in a position to do so by to-morrow, and that is as close as I can get. [Applause.]

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of tariff and labor.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of tariff and labor. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

#### RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATION BILL.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN] is recognized for two and one-half hours.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, so as to have it pending—

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I suggest the bill be laid before the House and the Senate amendment reported.

The SPEAKER. That is correct; and the Clerk will report the bill by title and report the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

The bill (H. R. 13811) entitled "An act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes."

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That the sum of \$20,000,000 be, and the same hereby is, appropriated out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be immediately available and to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers, for the preservation and maintenance of existing river and harbor works, and for the prosecution of such projects heretofore authorized as may be most desirable in the interests of commerce and navigation, and most economical and advantageous in the execution of the work: *Provided*, That allotments from the amount hereby appropriated shall be made by the Secretary of War upon the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers: *Provided further*, That allotments for the Mississippi River from the Head of Passes to the mouth of the Ohio River shall be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War in accordance with the plans, specifications, and recommendations of the Mississippi River Commission as approved by the Chief of Engineers: *And provided further*, That at the beginning of the next session of Congress a special report shall be made to Congress by the Secretary of War showing the amount allotted under this appropriation to each work of improvement."

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, so as to have the same pending, I move that the Senate amendment be agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN] moves that the Senate amendment be agreed to.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I do not make this motion because I like the provision which the Senate has given us as a substitute for the bill we sent them months ago. On the contrary, I do not hesitate to say I am not at all pleased with it. I make the motion to concur because I am instructed by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors to do so. I also make it because I am convinced it is the only thing to do if we are to have money to prosecute the work on the many great projects for river and harbor improvement now under way or to maintain in their efficiency those already completed.

If I were actuated by the rule-or-ruin spirit, if I were to say as others have said—if not in words, in acts—adopt my views or our navigable waterways will get nothing, I might perhaps take a different view; but I am convinced it is either this amendment or nothing; that we must either take what the

Senate, after keeping the bill six months, has deigned to give or else cease work on the most of the projects now under way, at least until after the 4th of March next, a course of action that would result in much damage not alone to uncompleted but to completed works as well. Not only is it of great importance that a work once started should go on without material interruption to completion, but that a finished project should be maintained in its efficiency, otherwise great damage might be done both to the work and the commerce to be accommodated by it.

Already much loss has resulted from the delay in passing this bill. As early as the 11th of July last the Chief of Engineers furnished to the Rivers and Harbors Committee a statement, accompanied by a list, showing the improvements upon which work had then stopped or would cease within the two or three months following. From this statement it will be seen that work on 106 projects out of the 225 provided for in the House bill were in those classes. In the statement accompanying the list the Chief of Engineers said that:

On account of lack of funds work is now suspended, or will shortly be suspended, on about one-third of the works provided for in the pending river and harbor bill. Should no act be passed at this session, the number of works suspended will be very considerably increased before an act could be passed at the next session of Congress. The suspension of work results not only in positive loss of time and possibly interference with navigation, but seriously handicaps and greatly adds to the cost of future work by the disorganization of working forces and the effect which it has upon the confidence of contractors supplying materials or doing work for the department.

I shall print with my remarks a copy of this statement, with the accompanying list, which throws considerable light upon conditions already resulting from the delay from passing this measure and those that will result if we pass no bill at all.

Nor would I object to this provision because I think it carries a sum too small for the work contemplated by it. On the contrary, I regard the sum as sufficient for the purposes intended. Likely it could stand a slight, but only a slight, reduction, for the bill has been delayed so long in the Senate that a considerable part of the fiscal year has gone by, so that as much money is not now needed at any place as if the measure had become a law by the 30th of June last, the end of the fiscal year covered by the estimates upon which the bill of 1914 was framed, while in some localities—those in the more northerly districts, for instance, where work can not be carried on in the winter months—less will be needed. So I repeat that the amount provided in the Senate amendment is, in my opinion, ample for all the purposes it was intended to answer.

Although I think any amendment interposed by the Senate ought to have retained other features of the House bill, the dislike I have to the provision now before us is based largely on the ground that by appropriating a lump sum for the Secretary of War to distribute we abdicate for the time being our legislative functions in favor of an administrative branch of the Government. Nor is my objection to the provision based upon any lack of faith in the engineers, but because I think such legislation in a majority of instances is unwise. There is quite a tendency now in that direction, and if this should be regarded as a precedent to be followed in the future it would leave little worth having in the hands of the lawmaking body so far as legislation for the improvement of our rivers and harbors is concerned. But it need not, nor do I believe it will, be taken as a precedent or followed hereafter, as the objections to it, save under exceptional conditions, are too manifest.

I believe Congress should ordinarily apportion all sums appropriated for river and harbor work among the various projects adopted by it. With the information at hand or easily obtainable for intelligent action, we are as capable of exercising that function as the Army Engineers—and I yield to none in my admiration for that splendid corps of officers—but the responsibility is ours, and we should not ordinarily shirk it. We may make mistakes, and doubtless do, but so may the engineers, with no direct responsibility to the electorate, while for our errors we may be held answerable to the people. But this is an exceptional case, and as such we should deal with it here and now. I am willing to assume my share of the responsibility, which I do with the hope and the belief that it will not be drawn into a precedent for similar legislation in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I know some are disinclined to accept this amendment—at least, not at present—on account of a hope they have that by disagreeing to it or by agreeing with certain amendments the new projects in the House bill, some of them of great importance and all worthy, may be inserted along with the surveys, which were likewise eliminated by the Senate amendment. But anyone who has followed the debates in the Senate on the measure must see the futility of such an effort.

Those discussions and the various amendments there proposed revealed at least two groups of Senators as their respective advocates, whose differences were never composed, but seemingly grew more pronounced as the weeks and months went by. Moreover, it is the view of many there that nothing can come of any effort at amending either by reinserting the eliminated items or even apportioning here the money provided among the various projects upon which it is to be expended. In other words, it seems to be this or nothing, and, in my opinion, it is the part of wisdom to accept it. Then, again, I am satisfied, unless we permit our actions in adopting this amendment to be drawn into a precedent, no harm not already suffered by the delay will be done, as it is expected another bill will be framed at the next session, when the items omitted from this bill may be considered and adopted. The preparation of such a measure should begin in a few weeks and become a law, if at all, by the 4th of March next, so that no considerable delay is likely to be encountered. Hence I say no great harm can come from the action proposed.

Mr. Speaker, on the 26th of March last we passed through the House the annual bill for this year, which, after six months, comes back to us with all its provisions for maintenance and original construction work on more than 300 projects, together with other important provisions, including those of surveys, stricken out and a single provision appropriating a lump sum to be distributed by the engineers inserted in their stead. As it left the House, the bill was an excellent measure—not faultless, perhaps, but one framed in accordance with that policy of river and harbor improvement we have been following for nearly two decades; a policy based upon public sentiment, indorsed by all the great political parties, and demanded by the rapidly growing commerce of the country. Since and including the bill of 1896 we have enacted into law nine general river and harbor bills and two small emergency measures, the whole aggregating \$483,375,023.43.

The bill of 1896, passed over President Cleveland's veto at a time when we were borrowing money, was the largest that had ever been passed up to that time, carrying as it did \$76,195,570.37. Then followed the bills of 1899, 1902, and 1905, all liberal measures, which in turn were succeeded by the act of 1907, providing for 361 projects and carrying \$86,872,432—the largest ever enacted into law by the Congress of the United States. I wish especially to call the attention of the critics of the bill of 1914 to this measure, and would like to have them compare it in all its details, including items and amount, with that of 1914 as it passed the House.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, may I ask my colleague one question?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Who was chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee in 1907?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Hon. THEODORE E. BURTON, now Senator from the State of Ohio.

The bill of 1907 has been referred to by some, and regarded, no doubt, by many, as the best ever enacted in the history of river and harbor legislation. It has been said that it was framed on scientific lines—whatever that may mean—and provided for the completion of a larger number of projects than any other. Nor am I disposed to detract from its merits. On the contrary, I wish to say that it was an excellent measure; and yet this bill, the one we are now considering, abused and traduced as it has been, was framed along the same lines as that, and was similar in form and substance, except that, being an annual bill, this did not carry, and did not need to carry, so much by way of authorizations as that of 1907.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I will.

Mr. MOORE. Is it not a fact the bill of 1907, passed at the time Mr. BURTON of Ohio was chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, was a bill which contained items affecting nearly every State in the Union, and nearly every congressional district, so it was almost impossible for a vote to be obtained against that bill in the House?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Well, I would not like to say that; but I will answer the first part of the gentleman's question—

Mr. MOORE. But did not the newspapers at the time so report, and was it not common rumor over the country that the bill was so built up it was bound to pass?

Mr. SPARKMAN. There has never been a river and harbor bill—at least during the past 20 years—that has not been criticized by somebody. The bill contained items affecting every section of the country, from Maine to Puget Sound, and carried, as I said a moment ago, a larger amount than any bill before or since.

Mr. MOORE. Does the gentleman remember the difficulty of finding anybody in the House to vote against the bill at the time? Is not that the fact?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Very few did vote against it.

Mr. MOORE. Yes; it is a fact that very few did vote against the bill then.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That measure also exceeded this bill in the number of projects treated. The former, carrying appropriations for 361 improvements, provided for the completion of 99, or 27½ per cent of the whole, while the latter, containing 301 items, provided for the completion of 71, or 23½ per cent, or a little more than 3 per cent in favor of the bill of 1907, if that feature is to be taken as one of merit.

Mr. FREAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I will.

Mr. FREAR. Was that an annual bill, the bill of 1907?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Oh, no; it was intended, I believe, to provide for two years, and carried a little more than twice as much as the amount carried in this measure.

Mr. FREAR. This bill provides for annual payments.

Mr. SPARKMAN. But it is about the same in substance, because that act provided for two years, carrying nearly \$87,000,000, whereas this bill as it passed the House provided for one year and carried about \$43,000,000.

Mr. FREAR. Will the gentleman yield for one other question?

Mr. SPARKMAN. If the gentleman will pardon me, I would like to finish; and if he will note his questions, I will be glad to yield at the end of my remarks.

Mr. FREAR. All right.

Mr. SPARKMAN. But in the matter of provisions for completing projects the present measure as it left the House was far ahead of any of the others passed during the period mentioned. There is another comparison, however, based upon the proportionate cost of the new projects adopted in each and the freight tonnage of the respective waterways involved that is somewhat in favor of the House bill of this year. The bill of 1907, for instance, adopted 63 new projects, accommodating in the aggregate 126,963,567 tons of commerce and requiring \$42,728,000 to complete, while the bill of 1914 as it left the House contained 71 new projects, calling for \$42,479,000 to complete and accommodating a tonnage of 146,728,920. From these figures it will be seen that not only was the aggregate cost of the new projects about the same in each bill, but that the average number of tons per project was likewise about the same, that of 1914, however, being somewhat larger.

A further analysis of the two bills shows that the cost of the projects in the bill of 1907 which may properly be designated as small projects—that is, projects requiring less than \$100,000 to complete—amounted altogether to \$1,172,512, but that they accommodated a commerce of only 4,494,994, while the projects in the bill of 1914, calling for less than \$100,000 to complete, required \$1,170,247 and accommodated a commerce of 19,258,000. In other words, while the smaller projects of the bill of 1907 were accommodating at the time the bill was passed a little less than 4 tons of freight for each dollar to be expended, the same class of projects in the bill of 1914 was, when that bill passed the House, accommodating a little more than 16 tons for each dollar required to complete. Certainly this does not show a wanton waste of money on small projects.

I will insert just here a statement of new projects in each of the two measures, giving amounts to complete, together with the tonnage and value of the freight accommodated by such waterway at the time as shown by the reports recommending the respective projects.

*Statement showing new projects, cost to complete, and amount appropriated for such items in the river and harbor act of 1907, together with tonnage accommodated by the waterways covered by said projects.*

	Amount estimated to complete.	Amount appropriated.	Commerce.	
			Tons.	Value.
Cape Porpoise Harbor, Me.	\$46,000	\$46,000	8,000	.....
Penobscot River, at Bangor, Me.	130,000	130,000	248,869	.....
Kennebec River, Me.	275,000	275,000	400,735	.....
Beverly Harbor, Mass.	39,683	38,500	150,002	.....
Dorchester Bay and Neponset River, Mass.	125,233	125,233	332,000	.....
New Bedford and Fairhaven Harbors.	527,000	100,000	809,149	.....
		1,200,000		

\*Continuing contract authorization.



Statement showing new projects, cost to complete, etc.—Continued.

	Amount estimated to complete.	Amount appropriated.	Commerce.	
			Tons.	Value.
Newport Harbor, R. I.	\$250,900	\$85,000	1,770,816	
Bridgeport Harbor, Conn.	463,000	113,000	944,929	\$16,546,754
Norwalk Harbor, Conn.	63,500	63,500	200,000	
Thames River, Conn.	16,250	16,250	446,004	3,302,301
Coney Island Channel, N. Y.	188,300	188,300		
Black Rock Harbor, N. Y.	4,560,000	1,000,000	2,500,000	
Cold Spring Inlet, N. Y.	907,000	311,000		
Newark Bay and Passaic River, N. J.	1,216,775	1,596,000	2,567,000	
Perrin Bar, Delaware River	50,000	50,000	17,918	4,927,450
Salem River, N. J.	29,000	29,000	36,346	1,134,700
Cohansey River, N. J.	55,800	55,800	24,000	
Mispillion River, Del.	87,063	40,000	121,687	3,349,300
Broadkill River, Del.	33,330	33,330	30,000	
Tyaskin Creek, Md.	6,500	6,500	3,000	96,463
Crisfield Harbor, Md.	37,707	37,707	271,500	4,390,500
Elk River, Md.	18,803	18,803	29,086	327,059
Norfolk Harbor, Va.	1,132,000	282,000	11,000,000	500,000,000
Ocoquan Creek, Va.	19,000	19,000	25,880	200,000
Meherrin River, N. C.	6,000	6,000	8,000	1,000,000
Pamlico and Tar Rivers, N. C.	11,563	11,563	567,330	13,694,531
Cape Fear River at and below Wilmington, N. C.	1,392,750	165,000	871,106	49,223,307
Savannah Harbor, Ga.	1,000,000	300,000	3,801,049	194,836,773
Brunswick Harbor, Ga.	496,650	146,650	1,656,257	43,832,290
Fernandina Harbor, Fla.	115,000	115,000	737,378	9,986,425
Apalachicola Bay, Fla.	85,000	85,000	44,000	1,200,000
Withlacoochee River, Fla.	215,400	65,400	249,884	2,355,229
Mobile Harbor, Ala.	560,000	200,000	2,485,213	62,297,150
Conecuh River, Ala.	31,000	31,000	82,250	
Wolf River, Miss., and Jordan River	30,000	30,000	37,476	598,750
Tallahatchie River, Miss.	4,000	4,000	67,640	1,301,250
Big Sunflower River, Mass.	75,000	75,000	88,353	1,372,944
Waterway, Franklin to Mermentau, La.	289,202	89,202	188,792	1,396,026
Galveston Harbor, Tex.	3,985,100	1,200,000	2,330,000	515,073,828
Aransas Pass and Bay, Tex.	1,288,699	200,000	2,565	383,300
Texas Inland Waterway	433,829	133,829		
Sulphur River, Tex. and Ark.	36,000	36,000		
Cumberland River above Nashville	550,000	150,000	382,807	10,509,789
Cleveland Harbor, Ohio	98,000	98,000	11,419,797	
Ludington Harbor, Mich.	839,877	100,000	1,421,558	
Manistee Harbor, Mich.	147,488	25,000	469,870	
Cheboygan Harbor, Mich.	15,000	15,000		
Rouge River, Mich.	6,575	6,575	234,861	1,612,452
Detroit River	\$6,670,950	\$2,000,000	55,508,360	
St. Marys River at the Falls	6,250,000	1,470,950	44,270,680	\$416,965,484
Kenosha Harbor, Wis.	22,000	22,000	72,011	
Racine Harbor, Wis.	50,000	50,000	141,792	
Sheboygan Harbor, Wis.	40,000	40,000	1,376,767	
Manitowoc Harbor, Wis.	376,000	100,000	1,376,767	
Two Rivers Harbor, Wis.	50,000	50,000	43,599	
Duluth-Superior Harbor, Minn. and Wis.	1,768,000	525,000	22,676,145	196,751,583
Humboldt Bay and Harbor, Cal.	83,000	83,000	616,754	13,628,164
Petaluma Creek and Napa River, Cal.	15,239	15,239	494,983	
Columbia River and tributaries above Celilo Falls to mouth of Snake River.	400,000	120,000	6,000	180,000
Grays Harbor, Wash.	660,000	200,000	17,196	650,000
Do	2,500	2,500	47,250	250,000
Columbia River between Wenatchee and Bridgeport, Wash.	42,000	42,000	23,000	
Willapa River and Harbor, Wash.	25,000	25,000	76,713	456,213
St. Michaels Canal, Alaska	248,000	98,000	29,893	2,493,697
Honolulu Harbor, Hawaii	1,658,894	200,000	296,229	33,781,816
Hilo Harbor, Hawaii	1,700,000	200,000	161,419	5,737,540
San Juan Harbor, P. R.	757,500	157,500	921,050	35,000,000
Total	42,728,859	30,620,408	177,309,515	

Continuing contract authorization.

\$15,440 of the amount appropriated was to be applied to improving East Norwalk Channel, on which there was a commerce of 8,444 tons.

Local.

Statement showing the new projects in the bill of 1914 as reported to the House, together with amount to complete, amount therein appropriated, and the tonnage and value of the commerce then being accommodated by the waterways covered by said projects.

	Amount estimated to complete.	Amount appropriated.	Commerce.	
			Tons.	Value.
Wills Strait, Casco Bay, Me.	\$16,500	\$16,500		
Tenants Harbor, Me.	12,500	12,500	48,926	\$343,000
Everly Harbor, Mass.	123,000	61,500	325,053	2,173,365
Millford Harbor, Conn.	6,700	6,700	12,043	106,125
Greenwich Harbor, Conn.	35,000	35,000	101,500	9,000,000
New London Harbor, Conn.	230,000	170,000	841,113	78,323,083
Sterling Basin, Greenport Harbor, N. Y.	22,500	22,500	230,000	
Upper Bay, New York Harbor, N. Y.	\$20,000	250,000	14,186,489	1,915,644,233
East River, N. Y.	13,400,000	500,000	45,331,216	
Hudson River at Ossining, N. Y.	79,700	35,000	60,550	254,000
Tonawanda Harbor, N. Y.	(1)	(1)	556,207	
Matawan Creek, N. J.	\$72,000	\$72,000	80,000	\$191,000
Raritan River, N. J.	184,000	250,000	1,177,157	64,335,510
Shoal Harbor and Compton Creek, N. J.	56,800	56,800	92,015	701,440
Shrewsbury River, N. J.	295,000	100,000	1,306,000	6,820,750
Chester River, Pa.	3,600	3,600	138,000	895,600
Appoquinimink River, Del.	11,000	11,000	27,370	1,712,400
Murderkill River, Del.	31,468	12,000	34,895	1,472,750
Mispillion River, Del.	20,400	35,200	140,895	5,876,550
Chesapeake and Delaware Canal	6,785,710	1,300,000	811,245	
Curtis Bay Channel, Baltimore Harbor, Md.	123,700	61,850	10,029,875	
Breton Bay, Md.	3,000	3,000	14,000	
Herring Bay and Rockhole Creek, Md.	11,800	11,800	4,571	350,729
Tred Avon River (North and South Forks), Md.	19,600	19,600	26,532	1,160,549
Nansemond River, Va.	4,500	4,500	63,700	2,402,929
Hampton Creek, Va.	27,000	27,000	137,000	
Tangier Channel, Va.	16,434	16,434	5,000	321,000
Oyster Channel, Va.	11,250	11,250	18,600	350,000
Norfolk Harbor, Va.	1,114,000	270,000	28,307,501	1,600,000,000
Lockles Creek, Va.	4,100	4,100	3,000	50,000
Ocoquan Creek, Va.	43,000	21,500	49,558	140,962
Cuppernong River, N. C.	31,800	31,800	26,653	320,990
Northeast Cape Fear River, N. C.	25,375	25,375	150,019	1,600,000
Bennett River, N. C.	6,000	6,000	51,000	585,000
Deep Creek, N. C.	5,400	5,400	2,000	157,000
New begun Creek, N. C.	5,000	5,000	5,000	300,000
Lumber River, N. C. and S. C.	2,000	2,000		
Jeremy Creek, S. C.	5,000	5,000	2,000	49,000
Santee River, S. C.	10,000	10,000	62,300	1,000,000
Waterway, Charleston to Winyah Bay, S. C.	(1)	(1)	44,267	924,873
Waterway, Orangeburg to Charleston, S. C.	35,000	35,000		
Waterway, Charleston, S. C. to Savannah, Ga.	100,000	50,000		
Savannah Harbor, Ga.	154,000	154,000	3,120,620	29,444,103
Generals Cut, Ga.	1,000	1,000	200	200,000
Back River, Ga.	5,000	5,000	25,000	250,000
Oklawaha River, Fla.	733,000	175,000	102,647	1,179,445
Kissimmee River, Fla.	47,000	47,000	71,950	2,030,500
Caloosahatchee River, Fla.	25,000	25,000	109,200	4,370,000
Crystal River, Fla.	10,000	10,000	48,742	1,250,000
Anclote River, Fla.	22,000	22,000	34,100	1,033,375
Boca Ceiga Bay, Fla.	10,700	10,700	5,885	354,330
Deep Creek, Fla.	9,000	9,000	111,108	1,546,870
Waterway, St. George Sound to Rio Grande	3,632,910	330,000		
Bayou Teche, La.	315,000	100,000	864,835	8,222,312
Lake Pontchartrain, La.	32,000	32,000	731,818	4,905,667
Vermilion River, La. and channel to waterway	37,500	37,500	29,151	292,292
Colorado River, Tex.	25,000	25,000		
Cumberland River, above Nashville, Tenn.	4,500,000	340,000	308,055	7,750,730
Huron Harbor, Ohio	34,500	34,500	2,000,000	
Fairport Harbor, Ohio	238,500	158,000	2,754,256	17,662,727
Cuyahoga River, Ohio		5,000	14,296,078	75,250,255
Menominee Harbor and River, Mich. and Wis.	\$3,400	\$3,400	520,514	\$8,264,702
Sturgeon Bay and Lake Michigan Ship Canal, Wis.	33,000	33,000	500,000	4,051,000
Fox River, Wis.	(2)	(2)	145,830	631,632
Baudette River and Harbor, Minn.	2,750	2,750	71,000	
Michigan City Harbor, Ind.	42,000	48,600	30,000	
Chicago Harbor, Ill.	38,170	38,170	3,644,745	
Gasconade River, Mo.	6,500	6,500	47,589	420,000
Kansas River, Kans.	6,000	6,000	562,700	275,000
Richmond Harbor, Cal.	428,000	100,000	4,500,000	
Petaluma Creek, Cal.	7,500	7,500	231,735	12,719,747
Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, Cal.	5,880,000	200,000	500,000	30,000,000
Falls of the Willamette at Oregon City, Oreg.	80,000	80,000	500,000	
Willapa Harbor and River, Wash.	347,950	100,000	766,416	5,077,665
Columbia River at Cathlamet, Wash.	6,000	6,000	5,551,617	31,053,378
Skamokawa River, Wash.	1,800	1,800	780	10,000
Total	41,295,017	5,781,329	146,728,920	4,214,480,548

Transfer of funds.

Deed levee to State.

Again, there was a greater disproportion between the cost and tonnage of some of the items in the bill of 1907 than the cost and tonnage of similar items in the bill of 1914. For instance, in the former there was a project costing in all \$1,288,699, with an appropriation and an authorization of \$490,000 with only a commerce of 2,565 tons to its credit, while another, costing in all \$400,000, with an initial appropriation of \$120,000, only accommodated 6,000 tons of traffic.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman kindly indicate what those projects were?

Mr. SPARKMAN. If the gentleman will pardon me, when I shall have finished I will be glad to and will try to answer any questions propounded, but would prefer not to yield just now.

No such discrepancy between freight tonnage and cost of work can be found in the bill of 1914. Of course, the amount of commerce at the time a report is submitted is not the only criterion by which to judge a project, because prospective traffic as well as other matters should be considered; but it is not amiss to call attention to such differences when the one measure is severely criticized on the theory that it is made vicious by the presence of certain features, while the other, more obnoxious in those very particulars, is lauded as a work of superior excellence.

Moreover, anyone who will stop to compare the bill of this year as it left the House with other like measures during the past 20 years will be convinced that it is not subject to the criticisms leveled against it, or, if it is, that all the others are subject to like, indeed, to harsher, criticism.

Another matter to which I wish to direct attention is that although we had a bill in 1905, that of 1907, only two years after, carried nearly \$87,000,000, or twice as much as the House bill of this year, yet this measure has not only been condemned as a vicious waste of public money, but also on account of the number of smaller projects adopted, while the bill of 1907, carrying more than twice as much, is regarded as a model of perfection.

Now, I mention all this, Mr. Speaker, not only for the purpose of defending, as anyone so minded can, the bill which has been thrown aside in another body after weeks and months of the most violent criticism both there and in the press of the country, but also to illustrate the lack of knowledge of the subject discussed by those indulging in such criticisms and denunciations. Furthermore, we are to have another bill, I hope, at the next session, and it is barely possible that good may come of the analyses and comparisons I have been making.

Again, Mr. Speaker, these charges seem to be based somewhat upon the idea that the people at home want the appropriations this House was endeavoring to make. Well, that is true, for the demand comes from every part of the country where navigable waters exist or may be created at reasonable cost. But why do the people demand them unless they think they will be benefited by the desired improvement? The money asked does not go into the pockets of the people, who can neither receive nor hope to receive any benefit from an appropriation of that nature except in the way of improved navigable waterways. There can be no other reason for this demand, and the very fact that the people near a waterway demand its improvement is a strong though, of course, not a conclusive argument in favor of Government aid in making the improvement, for the people might be and sometimes are mistaken. But even then they are in a better position to judge of the merits of a proposition for such work than is one coming into the Halls of Congress from some remote section who, never having seen the waterway, is totally unacquainted with its merits and possibilities. But in any event they are honest in their demands, and it ill becomes anyone, no matter how limited his knowledge or wide his information on the subject of navigable waterway development, to condemn their representatives as thieves and grafters in making an honest and an honorable effort to carry out their wishes.

Mr. Speaker, no better illustration of the truthfulness of the adage that "a little learning is a dangerous thing" could be furnished than is afforded by the denunciation of this bill by some of its critics. Knowing little of past river and harbor legislation, and less of the policy upon which it is based, they have perhaps unwittingly been led into grievous errors and have done some harm to that important class of Government work. But unless the history of the past fails to repeat itself, their success, if indeed it can be called such, will be short lived, for the people demand the improvement of their navigable waterways and will not be denied. Of course no one wants extravagance or the adoption of projects without merit, but in my judgment the House bill of this year was neither extravagant in amount nor vicious in any of the items contained in it. Some, of course, were more meritorious than others, but none that did

not come clearly within the policy we have been pursuing for the last two decades. Not one but would if completed bring beneficial results commensurate with the cost of the work, not only to the people and the commerce in the immediate vicinity, but to those of the entire country. They all form a part of our great system of navigable waterways, now the greatest and soon to become the most perfect in the world unless the work of improvement which has been going on so satisfactorily for the past two decades is halted.

Think what it would mean to have all our more than 25,000 miles of inland waterways connected by an intracoastal system so as to afford even a barge traffic over each and all of these streams in order that freight, the products of this and foreign countries, could be carried from any one point to any other place in the country reached by a navigable stream, whether called a creek or a river. Think, if you can, how much it would add to the prosperity and happiness of the people. And all this can be furnished in a few years without excessive cost if the work is prosecuted on business principles and with a view to obtaining the best results with the money expended.

Mr. Speaker, there must be something captivating in magnitude and fascinating in largely multiplied numbers, for some of these critics while passing over in silence, or giving their indorsement to, projects costing millions, though affording no immediate promise of great commercial importance, will exhaust their vocabulary of denunciation and abuse in criticism of a small project costing only a few thousand dollars, but with perhaps a hundred times as much commerce, when the money to be expended is considered. Take, for instance, the seven small projects in North Carolina so severely criticized here and elsewhere. These works would only cost to complete about \$80,000, and yet in advance of the proposed improvement they now accommodate a traffic tonnage of 235,000 tons, valued at \$3,000,000. This is 3 tons of commerce—one year's traffic—for each dollar to be expended, with the promise of a largely increased tonnage in the future, while some large rivers passed over without notice or with little criticism, but costing tens of millions of dollars, only show a commerce of 1 ton for each two or three dollars expended in a given year, with the improvement extending over a long period of years. Now, I do not say that these large and more expensive improvements ought not to be made, for the most of them should. But the critic who sees nothing worth noting, either to praise or censure, in the larger, but everything to condemn in the smaller, is, to say the least, not a safe watchdog of the Treasury. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I have no sympathy and little patience with the view expressed by some that these smaller waterways are so distinctly local that their improvement is not justified by the Federal Government. The claim is made that they are only used by a few, and that their improvement benefits a very limited number in the localities near the waterways.

Not only is the tendency to minimize the utility of the stream, but its dimensions as well. Even though it be a river of respectable proportions, it is designated by its would-be witty, if not reasonable, critics as a creek or a duck pond, dry half the year, the other half useless, and more susceptible to macadamization than of any other kind of improvement.

It is needless to say that, while this may be wit of a certain order, the claim in no instance has any foundation in fact. Not one, no matter what it is called—whether creek, slough, or river—but is a useful artery of commerce; not one but is national in its scope and, if improved, would bring results commensurate with the expenditures required for its improvement. Each one flows directly or indirectly into the ocean, where its commerce may become coastwise or foreign, or, upon being landed upon wharves reached by railroads, may be carried thence to any or all parts of the country, and often is so carried. Take the rivers in the State of Florida, for instance, whether designated in cheap witticisms as creeks or sloughs, not one but carries an important commerce, some foreign, some interstate, thus falling as completely under the commerce clause of the Constitution and becoming as distinctly national as if the stream flowed through half a dozen States and required millions to improve its bed and banks.

The changes have been rung on the word "creek," in connection with the legislation proposed in the House bill of this year, until one would think that the measure was made up of creeks and sloughs, and yet there were only 12 in all, costing the relatively small sum of \$192,900 to complete, but accommodating a traffic of 644,664 tons valued at \$26,905,739. Can anyone truthfully say that such streams are unworthy of Government aid? If they are not worthy, then our whole policy of river and harbor improvement—a policy based upon the greatest good to the greatest number and which we have been pursuing for the past 20 years—is wrong and vicious.



Mr. Speaker, the work of waterway development by the National Government has been going on for nearly a century. At first it was undertaken with caution, but with our activities in that direction growing and extending, until we have, with the work now under way, perhaps accomplished 75 per cent of that necessary to fit our navigable waterways for the service demanded of them. The most of this work has been done or authorized during the past two decades, we having appropriated during this period over \$480,000,000 of the \$750,000,000 appropriated for that class of work since the beginning of our Government. The increased activity of recent years has been the result of the liberal policy we have been pursuing since about 1894. For that policy the people alone have been responsible, as we have but reflected their wishes in our legislation here. Neither have the expenditures been unnecessarily wasteful nor the works undertaken lacking in merit, except, perhaps, in a few isolated cases. Indeed, by comparing the work for the improvement of our navigable waterways in this country with those abroad it will be seen that less waste has occurred here, with fewer vicious projects undertaken, than has been the case in foreign countries.

Now, on former occasions here I have undertaken to show that it will require less than a quarter of a century to complete the work yet remaining to be done to place our waterways in such a condition as that they may easily and readily meet the greatest demands of our rapidly growing commerce. Nor will the cost be as heavy as that borne during the past two decades, for while we have appropriated in those years upward of \$480,000,000, it will, in my judgment, require less than \$450,000,000 to complete all the remaining work, including that under way and that yet to be undertaken. Is it not, then, the part of wisdom to go on to the end under the policy that has brought such magnificent results in the past? To this I think there can be but one answer, and that an affirmative one. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by printing a statement furnished by the Chief of Engineers, to which I referred some moments ago.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SAUNDERS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I presume it is not necessary to do so, but I reserve the balance of my time.

The statements referred to are as follows:

MEMORANDUM CONCERNING THE PRESENT STATUS OF CERTAIN RIVER AND HARBOR WORKS, AND PROBABLE EFFECT ON OTHERS, IN THE EVENT OF THE FAILURE OF THE PENDING RIVER AND HARBOR BILL.

JULY 11, 1914.

The estimates submitted by the Engineer Department in recent years have been submitted on the assumption that there would be a river and harbor act each year, the act to be passed during the long session becoming a law not later than June 30, and that passed during the short session to become a law not later than March 1. Every effort has been made to keep the estimates down to the amounts actually needed to permit of economical prosecution of the works adopted by Congress up to the dates mentioned, and by reason of the regular passage in the past four years of river and harbor acts, confidence that this policy would be continued has been gradually acquired; and not only the Engineer Department, but contractors engaged in furnishing materials or doing work under the department have acquired the same confidence, and have made their plans accordingly.

On account of lack of funds work is now suspended, or will shortly be suspended, on about one-third of the works provided for in the pending river and harbor bill. Should no act be passed at this session, the number of works suspended will be very considerably increased before an act could be passed at the next session of Congress. The suspension of work results not only in positive loss of time and possible interference with navigation, but seriously handicaps and greatly adds to the cost of future work by the disorganization of working forces, and the effect which it has upon the confidence of contractors supplying materials or doing work for the department.

A list is given herewith showing the present status of the work on a considerable number of river and harbor works. Of the works in urgent need of additional funds, attention is particularly invited to the following:

Boston Harbor, Mass., 35-foot channel: While money is on hand to pay all contract requirements for the completion of this channel, there are no funds available for the work of maintaining the completed portions. An estimate of \$200,000 was submitted for this work and is carried in the pending bill, and it is very desirable that this amount should be made available at an early day.

Hudson River, N. Y.: This project was adopted in 1910 with a view to completion within a period of four years. Considerable delay was experienced in getting this project started, but the work is now well under way and should be prosecuted without interruption. Unless additional appropriations become available all work carried on with Government plant and hired labor must be suspended by July 15, or such a reorganization of the working force be made necessary as will tend to further delay the completion of the project and increase the ultimate cost. This project is in extension of the New York State Erie Barge Canal, and the lock and channel involved should be available by the time that canal is completed.

Delaware River between Philadelphia and the sea: The existing (35-foot) project is being prosecuted at the rate of over \$1,000,000 a year. When the estimate for the current year was submitted it was prepared with the expectation that the appropriation would be made on or before June 30, 1914. Unless additional funds become available at an early day work with Government plant must cease and the present working

force be discharged. Work under contract must also be reduced to a minimum in order to cover office expenses and care of plant until work shall be resumed under future appropriations.

Absecon Inlet, N. J., and Wilmington Harbor, Del.: The river and harbor act of 1912 authorized the construction of dredges for these two localities. These dredges will be completed within the next few months, but no funds will be available for their maintenance or operation until provided by Congress.

St. Johns River, Fla.: Unless further funds are provided work with Government plant as at present organized must be suspended about October 1 and the plant laid up or transferred to other localities.

Channel from Apalachicola River to St. Andrews Bay, Fla.: This project was adopted in 1910 and is now near completion, but work with Government plant has already been shut down for lack of funds, and further operations must await additional appropriations. An item of \$85,000 for completion of this project is carried in the pending bill.

Black Warrior River, Ala., locks and dams: The pending bill contains an item of \$750,000 for the completion of this project. Unless these funds become available at an early day work on Dam No. 17 must be suspended.

Southwest Pass, Mississippi River: No funds are available for purchase of stone for raising the jetties, and this important work must be held in abeyance until additional appropriation is made.

Mississippi River between the Missouri River and Minneapolis, Minn.: This project is being prosecuted with a view to completion within a period of 12 years from 1910, and the estimates are prepared with the understanding that additional funds will be made available on or before June 30 of each year. Part of the work with Government plant has already been stopped, and more will be suspended on July 15. In addition to the loss to the United States incident to the breaking up of the present working force, storage of plant, etc., failure to proceed with the work at this time will entail great hardship on the contractors on account of large quantities of materials gotten together by them on their own responsibility with a view to future contracts, relying on the declared policy of Congress in favor of an annual river and harbor bill.

Monongahela River, Pa.: Work of reconstruction of Lock and Dam No. 6 will be suspended by August 1 unless additional appropriation be made available prior to that date.

Ohio River, locks and dams: Suspension of work by hired labor on this project will be necessary at an early day, as well as postponement of beginning construction of additional locks and dams, unless further appropriations are made available for the prosecution of this project, which is to be completed within a period of 12 years.

Columbia River at The Dalles-Cello Canal, Ore.: Work on this project is practically closed, and, as the overhead charges there are high, it would be desirable to shut down immediately and entirely if it were not probable that the appropriation for completion of the work which is carried in the pending bill would become available at an early day.

Coos Bay, Ore.: Unless funds become earlier available, work of dredging with Government plant will close down before August 1, thus losing a part of the most favorable season for work at this locality.

Columbia River, at the mouth, Ore. and Wash.: Without additional funds, work on this project must cease about August 15. Suspension of operations in connection with this improvement must be regarded as most unfortunate. The life of the trestle used in dumping rock into the jetty is short at best, and in addition to being expensive in first cost requires heavy expenditures for its upkeep. Deterioration is as rapid when not in use as when work is in progress. Experience has shown that periods of idleness involve very large sums for restoration of plant and equipment and also increased quantities of rock on account of scour at the exposed end of the jetty. Uninterrupted operations are therefore essential to economy and the accomplishment of the best results. Any considerable delay at this time would greatly add to the cost of an already expensive project.

Columbia and lower Willamette Rivers below Portland, Ore.: An expensive plant has been provided by Congress for use in cooperation with the port of Portland commission in securing and maintaining a 30-foot channel up to Portland. Unless funds are forthcoming this plant must be laid up about September 1.

Grays Harbor and Bar, Wash.: This project is similar to that at the mouth of the Columbia River. The work of repair and maintenance of the jetty trestle will be suspended August 1 unless additional funds are provided.

Mississippi River Commission: While work has not yet been suspended on the Mississippi River between Head of Passes and the mouth of Ohio River, a longer delay in providing additional appropriations will necessitate limiting the work of the commission to dredging and tend to exhaust all reserves for high-water protection works.

The remainder of the list is made up of works smaller in magnitude but perhaps relatively as urgent.

Memorandum showing present status of certain river and harbor works and condition at other localities in the event of the failure of the pending river and harbor bill.

Locality.	Status.
Boston Harbor, Mass., maintenance of 35-foot channel.	Work suspended for lack of funds.
Thames River, Conn.	Desirable maintenance dredging deferred from lack of funds.
New Haven Harbor, Conn.	Dredging will be suspended about Aug. 1.
Port Chester Harbor, N. Y.	No work in progress, due to lack of funds.
East Chester Creek, N. Y.	Do.
Westchester Creek, N. Y.	Do.
Tarrytown Harbor, N. Y.	Do.
Hudson River, N. Y. (day labor)	Part of the work must be suspended and the rest prosecuted under a less advantageous system.
Harlem River, N. Y.	Work will stop sooner or later this season.
Bronx River, N. Y.	Do.
Mamaroneck Harbor, N. Y., et al. in district.	Do.
Delaware River below Philadelphia, Pa.	Hired-labor work will be suspended at an early day and contract work be prosecuted at a minimum rate.
Cooper River, N. J.	Work now suspended for lack of funds.
Appoquinimink River, Del.	Do.
Raccoon Creek, N. J.	Work will be suspended in September.
Murderkill River, Del.	Work will be suspended in July.

Memorandum showing present status of certain river and harbor works and condition at other localities in the event of the failure of the pending river and harbor bill—Continued.

Locality.	Status.
Mispillion River, Del. (maintenance).....	Work will be suspended in August.
Wilmington Harbor, Del.....	No funds available for operation of new dredge upon completion, about Jan. 1.
Absecon Inlet, N. J.....	Do.
James River, Va.....	Work will be suspended about September.
Trent River, N. C.....	Work suspended for lack of funds.
Swift Creek, N. C.....	Do.
Waterway, Pamlico Sound to Beaufort Inlet, N. C.....	Do.
Cape Fear River, N. C.: Above Wilmington (maintenance)...	Do.
Below Wilmington.....	Work will be suspended Sept. 1.
Charleston Harbor, S. C.....	Work now suspended.
Congaree River, S. C.....	Work can be continued 3 months.
Altamaha, Oconee, and Ocmulgee Rivers, Ga.....	Hired-labor work will stop July 15.
St. Johns River, Fla.: Below Jacksonville.....	Hired-labor work with present plant will stop about Oct. 1.
Above Jacksonville.....	Work now suspended for lack of funds.
Clearwater Harbor—Tampa Bay Channel.	Do.
Apalachicola River, Fla.....	Do.
Flint River, Ga.....	Do.
Chattahoochee River, Ga. and Ala.....	Do.
Channel, Apalachicola River to St. Andrews Bay, Fla.....	Do.
St. Andrews Bay, Fla.....	Do.
Choctawhatchee River, Fla. and Ala.....	Do.
Escambia and Conecuh Rivers, Fla. and Ala.....	Do.
Alabama River, Ala.....	Hired-labor work will stop July 31.
Apalachicola Bay, Fla.....	Do.
Gulfport Harbor, Miss.....	Work suspended for lack of funds.
Mobile Bay, Ala.....	Do.
Channel from Mobile Bay to Mississippi Sound, Ala.....	Do.
Tombigbee River, Ala. and Miss.....	Do.
Mobile Harbor, Ala.....	Work will suspend in about a month.
Black Warrior River, Ala.....	If available, funds are used for Locks 2, 3, and 16; work on Lock 17 must suspend about Sept. 1. If funds are used to keep work going on Lock 17, work on Locks 2 and 3 must be suspended, interrupting navigation completely and dams not properly protected. Suspension of work may lead to great loss or damage.
Bayou Terrebonne, La.....	Work now suspended for lack of funds.
Bayou Grossetete, La.....	Do.
Bayou Teche, La.....	Work will suspend Nov. 1.
Bayou Plaquemine Brule, La.....	Work will suspend Aug. 15.
Trinity River, Tex.....	Open-channel work suspended.
Cypress Bayou, Tex. and La.....	Maintenance work suspended.
Red River above Fulton, Ark.....	Work will be suspended about November.
Red River below Fulton, Ark.....	Maintenance work suspended about Aug. 15.
Trinity River, Tex. (locks and dams).....	Work will be suspended about October.
Sabine Pass, Tex. (maintenance).....	Do.
Texas Coast Waterway: Guadalupe River.....	Work now suspended.
Aransas Pass to Pass Cavallo.....	Funds exhausted; dredging needed before next year's bill.
Brazos River to Matagorda Bay.....	Funds exhausted; dredging needed before next year's bill.
West Galveston Bay to Brazos River....	Do.
Aransas Pass to Corpus Christi.....	Do.
Brazos River: Lock No. 1.....	Work will be suspended Aug. 31.
Lock No. 8.....	Work will be suspended Sept. 30.
Quachita River, La. and Ark.....	Open-channel work now suspended.
Yazoo River, Miss.....	Do.
Big Sunflower River, Miss.: Open-channel work.....	Work now suspended.
Lock and dam.....	Work will be suspended about Sept. 15.
Quachita River, Lock 3.....	Work now suspended; very important; low-water period being wasted.
White River, Ark.....	Work now suspended for lack of funds.
Cache River, Ark.....	Do.
Current River, Ark. and Mo.....	Do.
Black River, Ark. and Mo.....	Do.
St. Francis River, Ark.....	Do.
Arkansas River, Ark. and Okla.: Snagging.....	Only half force working; suspend Sept. 1.
Dredging.....	Without further funds; will suspend Dec. 1.
Mississippi River: Ohio to Missouri River.....	Work already cut down one-half; will suspend all work except dredging Aug. 1.
Missouri River to Minneapolis.....	Day labor on dams and shore protection already suspended; all day-labor work including dredging must shut down July 15. No funds for care of plant and office expenses after Aug. 15. Failure to proceed will entail great hardship to contractors on account of materials gotten out for future work on their own responsibility.
St. Paul to Minneapolis.....	Must suspend about November.
Brainerd to Grand Rapids.....	Already suspended.
Missouri River: Kansas City to Sioux City.....	Work will be suspended by November.
Sioux City to Fort Benton.....	Work will be suspended by September.
Gasconade River, Mo.....	Work now stopped by lack of funds.
French Broad River, Tenn.....	Day-labor work already suspended.

Memorandum showing present status of certain river and harbor works and condition at other localities in the event of the failure of the pending river and harbor bill—Continued.

Locality.	Status.
Tennessee River, below Riverton, Ala....	Day-labor work will be suspended in 2 weeks.
Ohio River, Dam 39.....	Hired-labor work must suspend July 31.
Ohio River.....	Hired dredges must be released Sept. 1.
Pittsburgh Harbor.....	Maintenance work suspended.
Monongahela River, Dam 6.....	Day-labor work will be suspended Aug. 1.
Ohio River, locks and dams: Dams 12, 14, 19, 20.....	Contracts for movable parts must be deferred.
Dam 15.....	Work suspended in incomplete state Jan. 1.
Dam 26.....	Work suspended Sept. 1.
Dam 28.....	Work suspended Aug. 1.
Dams 21 and 22.....	Work can not be started.
Dam 43.....	Work will be suspended Sept. 30.
Ontonagon Harbor, Mich.....	Work suspended.
Agate Bay, Minn.....	Work will be suspended July 15.
Keweenaw harbor of refuge, Mich.....	Work can not be resumed.
Two Rivers Harbor, Wis.....	Work will be suspended Aug. 1.
Racine Harbor, Wis.....	Do.
Fox River, Wis.....	Work will be suspended Aug. 10.
Michigan City Harbor, Ind.....	Funds needed immediately for repairs and dredging.
South Haven Harbor, Mich.....	Work suspended awaiting funds for maintenance.
Ludington Harbor, Mich.....	Do.
Muskegon Harbor, Mich.....	Work will be suspended about Aug. 1.
Harbor Beach harbor of refuge, Mich.....	Repair work important; no funds available.
Toledo Harbor, Ohio.....	No funds available for maintenance; funds for contract dredging will be exhausted in September.
Huron Harbor, Ohio.....	Maintenance dredging prevented by lack of funds.
Charlotte Harbor, N. Y.....	Work suspended for lack of funds.
Los Angeles Harbor, Cal.....	Dredge will be laid up Jan. 1; funds needed to remove silting in East Basin.
Humboldt Bay, Cal.....	Work will be suspended Aug. 1.
Sacramento and Feather Rivers, Cal.....	Work will be suspended Jan. 1.
Coos Bay, Oreg.....	Work will close down before Aug. 1; bar dredge losing most favorable season for work.
The Dalles-Celilo Canal, Oreg.....	Work practically closed; overhead charges high.
Willamette River: Portland to Oregon City.....	Operations are suspended.
Above Oregon City.....	Operations will be suspended about Sept. 15.
Clatskanie River, Oreg.....	Operations are suspended.
Cowlitz River, Wash.....	Do.
Lewis River, Wash.....	Work will be suspended about Aug. 15.
Columbia and Lower Willamette Rivers, Oreg. and Wash.....	Work will be suspended about Sept. 1.
Columbia River, jetties at mouth.....	Work will be suspended about Aug. 15.
Columbia River, Bridgeport to Kettle Falls, Wash.....	Work now suspended for lack of funds.
Grays Harbor and Bar, Wash.....	Work will be suspended Aug. 1.
Grays Harbor and Chehalis River, Wash.....	Work delayed on account of lack of funds.
Mississippi River Commission.....	Failure of bill will necessitate limiting work to dredging and would exhaust all reserves for high-water protection works.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment, and ask to have it read for the information of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 6, line 11, after the word "of," strike out "\$20,000,000" and insert "\$5,000,000."

[Applause.]

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I offer another amendment, practically in the nature of a substitute, that I ask to have read at this time.

The SPEAKER. The amendment will be reported.

The Clerk read as follows:

That the sum of \$5,000,000 be, and the same hereby is, appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be immediately available and to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers, for the preservation and maintenance of existing river and harbor works: *Provided*, That allotments for maintenance from the amount hereby appropriated shall be made by the Secretary of War upon the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers: *Provided further*, That allotments for the maintenance of the Mississippi River from the Head of Passes to the mouth of the Ohio River shall be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War in accordance with the plans, specifications, and recommendations of the Mississippi River Commission as approved by the Chief of Engineers: *And provided further*, That at the beginning of the next session of Congress a special report shall be made to Congress by the Secretary of War showing the amount allotted under this appropriation to each work of maintenance.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask that I be notified at the end of 15 minutes.

I am opposed to the Senate amendment for this reason, among others, that it takes away from Congress the power of saying where this money shall be expended and places it entirely in the



control of the Government engineers. When the original river and harbor bill was being discussed in this House and while it was being discussed in the body at the other end of the Capitol, a constant criticism was made that the Government engineers had been unduly influenced or that they were incompetent or that they were biased in their judgment, and that the committees had been influenced in making up the bill by the report of the engineers, and that that influence was what had made the bill largely what was termed a "pork-barrel" proposition.

Now that criticism of the engineers, I think, is entirely unjust. [Applause.] From my experience with the engineers I believe that they are a competent body of men, and I am certain that they are as high-minded and honest as any men in this country. [Applause.] I have never seen the slightest indication to justify any of the criticisms in regard to the engineers, except, of course, in some cases where it was a matter of judgment. Like all other men, they make mistakes in that regard. But criticism of the engineers was the foundation for the criticism of this bill. Yet when it comes back from the Senate we find that those distinguished gentlemen who had been criticizing the engineers finally succeeded in sending it back here with a lump sum of \$20,000,000, leaving that to be apportioned entirely by the engineers and take away all control over these expenditures by Congress. If ever there was a "pork-barrel" proposition brought before the Congress, it is this Senate amendment. The "pork" has not been taken out of this bill, if there was any in it at the beginning. It simply has been cut in two, and they come now and ask us to stultify ourselves—we, the members of the committee—and admit that we have been guilty of what they term a "pork-barrel" proposition; that we have been guilty of trading with each other; that we have recommended projects that were unworthy; and ask us to confess that we were trying to loot the Treasury and that we are still willing to take 50 cents on the dollar if we can not get any more.

Mr. TREADWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes.

Mr. TREADWAY. If it is just cut in two, will it not be more available if it is designated as to the places where it is to be used?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. On the other proposition, if the House bill was grand larceny, this is petty graft; and as between the two I would rather have the dignity of stealing a larger sum.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Not just at this moment, but later on.

The proposition they make is this, and this is the main reason why I am opposed to this bill. Remember that if there was a bad proposition in the House bill or in the Senate bill, it is still there. Not a single proposition has been eliminated from the expenditure of this money. The only difference is that the bad proposition and the good proposition may each get 50 cents instead of a dollar. We have simply cut the proposition in two. But the worst feature of this proposition is this: We propose now to throw the whole matter into a lump sum, and then the man that has the most influence will get the biggest chunk of pork. And they ask self-respecting men on that committee to approve of a proposition of that character. They propose to take the \$20,000,000 and place it in a lump sum, and then place it where the man that can bring the most influence on the engineers will get the most money. I say that it is unjust and is unfair to those engineers, who, to a certain extent, hold their positions by favor of Congress. That is, they are in a position where, at least, they can be greatly annoyed; perhaps greatly injured. This \$20,000,000 is not sufficient to take care of half of the propositions in this country, and placing upon the engineers the responsibilities under political pressure that will come of deciding as to where that money shall be expended is unjust and dangerous. It is well understood, because the proposition has been talked about—and I am violating no confidences—that certain members of the committee of another body that wanted \$20,000,000 as a matter of economy, and are willing to reduce it to that amount, are not willing that Congress shall say where it should be expended. If there were any bad items in the bill, they should be cut out; if there were any items that ought not to be allowed, let those be taken out of the bill. But when these propositions were submitted, the only answer is that it must be a lump sum or else it would never pass the Senate. Well, for one, if we are to be placed in a position where we must stand up and confess that we are not competent to draw a bill, that we are not competent to be trusted with legislation, that we must turn the matter over to the other body in a lump sum in order that they may fight over it and see who shall get the most of it, I am willing here and now, before I consent to such a proposition as that, to resign my place upon

the Rivers and Harbors Committee, because we have no longer any reason for our existence. [Applause.]

Now, we have offered an amendment here to reduce it to \$5,000,000, and I will tell you why. Because that will take care of the maintenance; that will take care of and prevent any destruction of Government property.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Will the gentleman permit an interruption? I just want to say that \$2,000,000 will do that.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Oh, yes; \$2,000,000 will do that; \$2,000,000 will take care of the maintenance, strictly speaking, but \$2,000,000 will not cover all the expenditures that ought to be made in order to prevent the Government from suffering injury.

For illustration, take the \$2,700,000 strictly for maintenance. I will give the gentleman an illustration. Under this beautiful proposition that has come back from the Senate you take the work that is going on at the mouth of the Columbia River, which, fortunately, is not in my neighborhood and does not in any way affect me politically. They have their railroad tracks there. They have their buildings assembled. They have a force of five or six hundred men, or had when I was there a year ago. They have their machinery. Now, under this proposition that whole matter stops. We want, in addition to maintenance, sufficient to protect that plant and protect that work until we can get sufficient money to continue it.

And in view of the fact that this pressure has been brought to cut this bill in two, because of the plea that has been made, not openly, but underneath the surface, that the war abroad has brought on a condition where we must economize, if we are going to economize and cut some propositions and stop work on part of the river and harbor projects of this country in the name of economy, why not treat all alike and economize by stopping work on all of them? [Applause on the Republican side.] Why not stop all constructive work, if we are going to stop part, and simply provide sufficient money to protect the projects from deterioration?

We are told that the river and harbor appropriations shall be cut in two so that we can economize, so that we will not have to tax the people \$105,000,000 more. Yet, following after this bill, we are to have a ship-subsidy bill, and a ship-subsidy bill brought in by a Democratic majority—a ship-subsidy bill that proposes to subsidize ships built in foreign yards by foreign cheap labor, officered by foreigners, and manned by Chinese.

They propose to subsidize that kind of shipping. They have gone far beyond what any Republican ever advocated. I presume that I have been as persistent an advocate of ship subsidies as any man in the United States, but the Democratic proposition is far too much for me. If it comes to a time when, in order to get a merchant marine, we must buy foreign ships, built by foreign cheap labor and manned by foreigners and then subsidize them, I am unwilling to pay the price. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Then, we are talking about economy and must keep down the rivers and harbors bill and can not take care of the great improvements of our country in the interest of commerce, and yet there is standing back in the shadow a treaty whereby \$25,000,000 of the people's money is to be taken and paid to Colombia to mollify her feelings because we refused to be blackmailed by that country. Now, I wonder how much sincerity there is on this side of the House when you go to talking economy, when it comes down directly to your own propositions. I have seen men on that side of the House for the last 12 years standing up and orating against subsidies, but I never saw one, either upon that side of the House nor one on this side of the House, that ever voted against a proposition to expend money in his own district. And I am going to give you gentleman a chance to show whether you are in favor of it now. I have discovered, since I have been a Member of this House, that the difference between "a subsidy" and "a wise expenditure of the public money" depends upon who gets it. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the rest of my time, unless somebody wants to ask me a question.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask my colleague a question, if he will permit.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Certainly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Would not the expenditure of \$20,000,000 as a lump sum by the Board of Engineers result in extreme criticism and the discrediting of that board after the expenditure, no matter how well they tried to expend it?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes. Let me answer that by giving my colleague a few of the facts, without mentioning any names. The reason why this lump-sum proposition is here—and I speak advisedly—is because certain distinguished gentlemen could not agree upon how it was to be divided, and



they did agree to throw it all into a pot and take their chances on getting what they thought was their part afterwards. That is the truth about it, and that is the reason why we have a lump sum here, instead of dividing it. The very moment they attempt to parcel out this \$20,000,000, then trouble commences, because every man wants his project taken care of. You can imagine what this is going to lead to when you appropriate this \$20,000,000 in a lump sum. It will not be on the statute books 15 minutes before the engineer's office will be crowded with Senators and Representatives demanding that their projects, at least, be taken care of. It is the most disgraceful proposition that has ever been submitted to Congress since I have been here. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUSSELL].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUSSELL] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply interested in this bill, because my constituents are interested in it, and also because I recognize that it is one of very great importance to the transportation interests of the country. It is generally confessed to-day that water transportation is the cheapest known to commerce, and the improvement of inland waterways is one of the most important questions of the age. It was believed that this bill as it passed the House would do very much to promote the cause of transportation and of commerce over the waterways of this country, and I, with many others in the Mississippi Valley, am greatly disappointed by the action of the other branch of Congress in adopting this amendment.

Like the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY], who has just spoken, I regret exceedingly that the Senate has seen fit to reduce this appropriation from \$53,000,000 to \$20,000,000, but I do not fully appreciate his logic when he objects to the reduction from \$53,000,000 to \$20,000,000 and then seeks to further reduce it by offering an amendment proposing to place it at \$5,000,000. I agree with him that I would much prefer that Congress should control the allotments of this money rather than that it should be done by the Secretary of War and the Government engineers. Still I am for this bill now, because I understand from the chairman of the committee and from other sources of information that it is a question of this bill or no bill at all at this session of Congress. Moreover, I have confidence in the ability and judgment of the Government engineers, and believe that they will place the money where most needed and where it will do the most good.

In the district where I live, with five counties bordering upon the Mississippi River, the matter of water transportation is one of the very greatest importance, and especially to-day, since the Panama Canal is completed, as we hope in the early future to see the products of the soil and of the factory in that section loaded upon ships that will carry their cargoes to all the markets of the civilized world without change. While these appropriations are made, as I understand and appreciate, for the purpose of improving the channels of the rivers and for the purpose of navigation, still there are incidental benefits of very great importance that our country appreciates and that are of great value to my constituents.

The country in which I live is sometimes overflowed, and in the last two years we have had floods from the Mississippi River which were unprecedented in the history of this country that destroyed property worth many millions of dollars. I understand that levees are not constructed exclusively for the purpose of protecting property, but primarily to aid navigation; still they do protect the flooded country from these annual overflows and are of incalculable value to the thousands of citizens who reside behind them. There are growing cities of great importance and wealth that are sometimes menaced by caving banks, and revetment of the river banks in many cases is proper and important. I regret that the \$20,000,000 carried in this bill seems to be all we can get at this session of Congress, but I realize that it is only a short time, only a little more than two months, until the next regular session of Congress will convene, and I have every reason to hope that this amount will take care of the most important improvements now required until Congress shall convene in regular session in December. So in supporting this bill to-day it is not as a matter of choice, as between the bill originally passed by the House and this bill, but it is because it seems to be the only bill that can be passed at this session of Congress, and as such I heartily approve it and support it. [Applause.]

Mr. SPARKMAN. Will the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KENNEDY] use some of his time now?

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to myself.

I regret that I can not vote with the majority of the committee to concur in the Senate amendment to the rivers and harbors bill. While I believe in river and harbor improvements as a general proposition, we are confronted at this time with a condition in the country brought about by the falling off of the revenues that calls for the practice of the most rigid economy in governmental expenditures.

The Senate amendment provides that a lump sum of \$20,000,000 shall be appropriated, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers, for the preservation and maintenance of existing river and harbor work and for the prosecution of such projects heretofore authorized as may be most desirable in the interest of commerce and navigation and most economical and advantageous in the execution of the work. The amendment cuts out all new projects provided for in the House bill and eliminates the surveys authorized in that measure. You will notice there is no limitation in the amendment on the amount that may be allotted to any project, the only condition being that the project on which the money is to be expended must have been previously authorized. It leaves the whole matter in the discretion of the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers as to the amount that shall be spent on the various works now being prosecuted. If there is any ground for the criticism made of the Engineer's Office in another body, this amendment would only accentuate it, for under its provisions the engineers can allot any sum to any project which has been authorized up to the amount necessary to complete the project.

Now, I am opposed to large lump-sum appropriations for any department of the Government, for I believe such a policy breeds extravagance and is inimical to the economical administration of governmental affairs. [Applause on the Republican side.] Now, what will happen in case this amendment is agreed to and the bill becomes a law in its present form. The Engineer's Office will be overwhelmed by requests from Members of Congress and organizations in localities that are interested in works that are now being prosecuted for more liberal allotments than the urgency of the work being carried on would merit, and sufficient pressure will be brought to bear in some cases to allot sums from this fund to projects where it is not most urgently needed in the interest of navigation. I am opposed to this amendment because I do not believe such a large sum is needed at this time. How was the amount of \$20,000,000 arrived at as being the necessary amount to carry on the work until the funds of the next rivers and harbors bill should become available? Was there any investigation made on the part of the Engineer's Office to ascertain the amount that would be required to tide over the work for the few months until the next bill becomes a law? There was not; in fact, the engineers are quoted as saying that it would require some three weeks to acquire sufficient data to tell just what amount was needed. If the policy of yearly bills is to be continued, the next one must become a law before the 4th of March, and as amounts carried in the rivers and harbors bills are available from the time the bill becomes a law the next bill will provide funds in ample time to resume work early in the spring, which bill can be made up based on accurate data furnished by the Engineer's Office.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MOORE. Does the gentleman think that the appropriation of \$20,000,000 at this time will lead to the expenditure of money in certain sections of the country, by reason of the fact that frost and ice will prevent any work being done in other sections of the country?

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. I think so. Conditions in the Northern States are such that navigation closes about the middle of November, and after this money is allotted it will be impossible to accomplish anything on any project where the climate is rigorous.

Mr. MOORE. If the \$20,000,000 is appropriated speedily, and the engineers get to work speedily, as they undoubtedly will, they will be able to finish up certain projects in sections of the country that are not subjected to climatic rigors, so that at least some work could be done in those parts of the country before the season closes.

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. Yes; some work could be done in those places. But take the case of the upper Mississippi. Work has been suspended there already, crews laid off, and fleets laid up. Now, by the time this money is allotted there will not be more than 15 or 20 days before navigation closes, and they can not accomplish anything to speak of in the northern part of the country this season.



Mr. MOORE. Then during the months of November, December, January, February, and March, in the judgment of the gentlemen, there would be very little work done in the Northern States. Is that the gentleman's idea?

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. I think little, if anything, could be done.

Mr. MOORE. Then is it the thought of the gentleman that the bulk of the money would go into States that are not affected by these climatic conditions and rigors?

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. I should think if the money is to be expended before the money in the next appropriation bill is available, it will necessarily have to be expended largely in territory not affected by winter conditions.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. Certainly.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The gentleman does not consider, however, that that would be an objection to appropriating a sum of money to be expended by the engineers? In other words, I do not suppose his objection to the lump sum is based upon the idea that there might or would be frost in one section and none in another?

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. I have stated heretofore two or three of my reasons that were not along that line. But we have a right to expect equal treatment to all parts of the country.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Of course the gentleman understands that there could not be equal treatment if conditions would not permit work to be carried on in northern latitudes during the winter months. I want to add that none of us here in the House, neither the chairman or other members of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, are responsible for the fact that this work has not been going on during the time of the year when the money could have been properly and judiciously expended on projects in more northerly latitudes.

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. But the condition exists, and the money would be chiefly expended in the South.

Mr. SPARKMAN. In other words, I do not think sectionalism should enter into the matter at all, and I hope it may not.

Mr. MANN. It has.

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. Now, it is contended that great loss will ensue to the Government if this sum is not provided at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. I yield to myself five minutes more.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for five minutes more.

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa. I do not believe that any great loss would be sustained if this bill should fail to pass. It has been generally understood for months that no rivers and harbors bill would pass at this session of Congress, and members of the committee joined in this belief. Now, when there is a probability that no additional funds will be provided, or rather that the rivers and harbors bill will fail of passage, before the funds are completely exhausted in the various districts a sufficient amount is set aside to keep intact the organization, so there will be no delay in resuming work when additional funds are provided.

It is claimed that contractors who engage in river and harbor work will sustain losses if this bill does not pass. As the law prohibits the engineers from entering into contracts for river and harbor work unless the funds are available to pay for same or the contract is authorized, in which case it is carried in the sundry civil bill; so that no work can be contracted for unless funds are on hand or in sight at the time the contracts are entered into. So that contractors would not be affected on any work being prosecuted at this time. I take it that they have felt as we have felt—that there would be no rivers and harbors bill at this session and have "trimmed their sails" to meet such a contingency.

The House bill was passed on March 26 and went to the Senate, where it remained for six months waiting action by that body. The bill was before the Senate practically the whole time that river and harbor work could be carried on in the northern part of the country. Take the upper Mississippi, where I am somewhat familiar with conditions. Part of the work was suspended early in the summer owing to a lack of funds, and for some time the fleets which have had this work in charge have been laid up and the crews scattered so that it would be absolutely impossible by the time it could be arranged to resume work to accomplish anything this season, because navigation closes about November 15; and if this bill should pass it would not be possible to do anything on the upper Mississippi River project and no funds would be required to carry them over until the next rivers and harbors bill becomes a law.

I take it that the condition on the upper Mississippi is typical of conditions in the Northern States, where very little work could be done even if we should provide the twenty millions contemplated in this amendment.

It seems to me if a war tax is to be levied to raise a hundred millions of dollars that we should retrench in every way possible, and that here is an opportunity to practice it. [Applause on the Republican side.] I do not believe the country will approve of appropriations that are not absolutely necessary and that can be very well postponed until some future time.

The proposed war tax at 2 cents per gallon will mean a yearly burden on the people of the State, which in part I have the honor to represent, based on the consumption of gasoline in the State for the past year, of \$1,500,000, and that is only taking into consideration the increase of 2 cents per gallon, which is the amount of the tax levied, and in all probability the increase to the consumer will be even greater than that amount.

Iowa has some 200 more banks than any State in the Union, and under the proposed war tax the capital stock and surplus of these institutions will also be taxed. Our people will also be taxed under almost every other provision of the war-tax bill. I do not believe the people of my State or the people of the country will approve of this appropriation of \$20,000,000 at this time without any data on which to base it, and I shall vote for the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Washington for an appropriation sufficient to maintain the work which is now being prosecuted, and which I believe is all that is necessary to be done at this time.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, for two minutes, in which to place before the House two telegrams that I have received.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent for two minutes to place before the House two telegrams.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Reserving the right to object, I want to ask if that will come out of the time allotted here to-day?

Mr. MANN. The gentleman can only get time by having it yielded to him.

Mr. HOBSON. I will ask each of the two gentlemen to give me one minute.

Mr. MANN. I suggest that the gentleman ask it from his own side of the House.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield one minute to the gentleman from Alabama.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for one minute.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to place before the House two telegrams protesting against the emergency revenue bill. They are as follows:

LAWRENCEVILLE, ILL., September 26, 1914.

Hon. RICHMOND P. HOBSON,  
Washington, D. C.:

Southern Illinois conference of 225 pastors of 50,000 Methodists voted unanimous protest against Underwood liquor revenue increase.  
WILBUR H. THIRKELD,  
Bishop J. C. KIMSON, Secretary.

PORTLAND, OREG., September 25, 1914.

Hon. RICHMOND P. HOBSON,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

The Oregon Methodist Episcopal conference, in annual session assembled and representing a constituency of over 50,000 citizens of Oregon, do earnestly protest against the passage of the Underwood bill to add increased revenue tax on beer and domestic wines, thus making the Government more dependent upon liquor revenues and thereby increasing the power of the liquor interests in national affairs. We sincerely call upon all Oregon Congressmen and Senators to use their utmost endeavors to secure the defeat or radical amendment of this bill.

RICHARD J. COOKE,  
Presiding Bishop of the Oregon Conference.  
C. C. RARICK, Secretary.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM].

[Mr. LINTHICUM addressed the House. See Appendix.]

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. WILSON].

[Mr. WILSON of Florida addressed the House. See Appendix.]

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND].

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I have been very much interested during my entire career in the improvement of inland waterways. I believe that in such a country as ours, with a great inland commerce and a vast extent of inland region remote from the seaboard, transportation is our greatest problem.

[Applause.] It will, I think, always be the greatest problem of this great Nation.

I regard the improvement of inland waterways as one of the great means of solving the problem of the constant pressure upon the transportation facilities of this Nation. I regret to see a wholesale attack made on the river and harbor bill prepared by a committee of this House on the ground that it is a pork-barrel measure designed purely to loot the Public Treasury in the interest of the private political fortunes of some of the Members. I should much prefer to have seen, and would have had much more confidence in the attack made on the bill, if the gentlemen could have pointed out and eliminated in the interest of the public the measures that they claim were unworthy in that bill. [Applause.]

I confess that it is only with the utmost regret that I shall vote for the Senate amendment to the river and harbor bill. I would not do it under any other circumstances than the circumstances that now present themselves. These circumstances are that projects have been authorized by the Rivers and Harbors Committee of this Congress; that these projects have been adopted with the consent of Congress, work begun upon them, and that work has come to a standstill because of the delay and failure of Congress to provide the necessary means.

In this situation the only solution with which we are confronted is either a wholesale cessation of the work or a lump sum placed at the disposal of the River and Harbor Board of the War Department. Of these two evils there can be but one choice, and for those interested in the permanent and continuous development of our inland waterways that is to choose the lesser of the two evils and accept a lump-sum appropriation placed in the hands of the board of engineers.

I hope Congress will never be confronted with that situation again, but will understand before a river and harbor bill is taken up in the future that the projects are to pass under the watchful eye of the representatives of the people, and that we are not to be confronted with another lump-sum appropriation. I am as much opposed to lump-sum appropriations as is the gentleman from Washington, and I can only conceive of their being acceptable to this House as a temporary expedient to tide over an emergency in which we now find ourselves.

I represent a project in the river and harbor bill which I not only regret, but resent hearing classed in a wholesale denunciation as a pork-barrel bill. I want to say to this House that I intend to put in as a part of my remarks a statement by men actively engaged in transportation on the Missouri River from Kansas City to St. Louis showing that 3,000 tons of freight are to-day moving down that river every month, and of that 3,000 tons of freight 65 per cent of it consists of wheat and flour. [Applause.] That shows that this is no pork barrel, but, if anything, that it is a great bread basket, for the improvement of that river has done what its friends said it would. It has opened up the granary of the West, has taken the farmers' wheat and the flour made from it and has provided the facilities by which it goes out to the Gulf for shipment to the Atlantic seaboard. The 3,000 tons of freight going down the Missouri River monthly is the direct product of the farms of the West and mills in the small towns of Missouri and Kansas. That transportation line on the Missouri River to-day is refusing to take tonnage of freight at St. Louis because its equipment has not kept pace with the demand for transportation facilities on that river. Under these conditions I resent the wholesale denunciation of the river and harbor bill as a pork-barrel measure.

Mr. EDWARDS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. Certainly.

Mr. EDWARDS. Has not the improvement of the Missouri River greatly reduced the freight rates on the railroads on all classes of freight?

Mr. BORLAND. I will say this, that the freight rates on the traffic actually carried is 80 per cent of the railway rates, and that 80 per cent absorbs the switching charges at terminals, so that it is a net saving to the shipper of 20 per cent. There has been a reduction from Mississippi River points and from Chicago to southern Kansas and Colorado, based partly on the improvement of facilities for water transportation, but there has been no general reduction in the local freight rates on the river, because the volume of traffic has more than kept pace with the facilities for transportation.

The statement referred to above is as follows:

KANSAS CITY, Mo., June 4, 1914.

#### PROJECT.

The Kansas City Missouri River Navigation Co. has a capital of \$1,202,000, subscriptions payable on the installment plan; slightly over \$1,000,000 paid in to date. The capital is divided into \$2,000 common stock and \$1,200,000 preferred, the common stock having full voting power and being owned in equal amounts by the 13 directors.

Printed copy of articles of association attached explains nature of corporation.

#### FLOATING EQUIPMENT.

Two towboats, 7 cargo box barges, and 1 packet and passenger steamer, all having steel hulls and the barges being steel throughout, absolutely fireproof, and all hulls having water-tight compartments for purposes of safety. Total horsepower of boats, 1,000; total carrying capacity of barges, 5,400 tons.

#### TERMINAL EQUIPMENT.

At the Kansas City terminal the city has provided a modern municipal wharf and warehouse, with mechanical freight devices; cost, \$75,000. Wharf is 526 feet long and 50 feet wide; warehouse 306 feet long and 40 feet wide, of steel mill-building construction, cement on metal lath, rubberoid roof, wharf and warehouse served by switch track to facilitate interchange of freight between water and rail.

At East St. Louis the company owns warehouse and wharf of modern design, equipped with modern freight-handling device, and served by switch track connected with all lines entering East St. Louis and St. Louis. For repair and quartering of boats the company has a shipyard at the mouth of the Kansas River, Kansas City, Kans., and one at the mouth of the Gasconade River, Gasconade, Mo.

#### OPERATIONS.

The packet steamer *Chester* carries passengers and freight between Kansas City and St. Louis, also serving the local points.

The towboats *A. M. Scott* and *Advance*, tow barges, carrying freight between Kansas City and St. Louis, operating night and day on the uptrip and daylight only on the down trip. Night operating downstream may safely be done when in improved stretches of the river, where the dangers of shifting channels are obviated.

Freight upstream averages 65 per cent third class and higher, the remaining 35 per cent being lower than third class. This is a very high average, and we do not know of any transportation company whose records will show equally good. This freight consists largely of dry goods, pianos, notions, hardware, groceries, steel and wire products, furniture, window and plate glass (in large quantities), chemicals, queensware, druggists' sundries, etc.; in fact, almost as varying as rail movement.

Downstream freight consists of export flour and grain products, livestock, and miscellaneous manufactured articles.

Our experience as to loss and damage claims shows about one-fourth in amount compared to a relative rail movement.

Most of the westbound freight comes to us in carloads from eastern lines, direct to our dock, where it is transferred by electric trolley and conveyed direct to boats and barges. On arrival at Kansas City the carloads are transferred to cars and switched to industries and warehouses having track connection. This gives the consignee exactly the same service as would be received from a rail line and enables us to secure freight which would not move by boat if it were necessary for the consignee to accept delivery at the river front.

Since the filing of our grain-products tariff with the Interstate Commerce Commission this spring we have had practically full-capacity loads of export flour downstream.

#### RATES.

Our rates are uniformly 20 per cent less than rail rates between the same points, and this rate includes the necessary switching of carloads to and from industries having track connection; in other words, shipments on our line show a net saving in freight of 20 per cent between the points we reach.

#### TONNAGE.

Last season we handled only 10,000 tons of freight, most of which was handled prior to July 15. After that date the stage of river was very low, due largely to the drouth west of us, and a great deal of channel difficulty was experienced. Government reports show the lowest stage of water after July 15, 1913, that has occurred in the past 20 years. At present we are handling over 3,000 tons per month, due partly to the securing of full capacity downstream and partly to increased equipment. The volume during June and July will show an increase due to the better stage of water prevailing during these months. Another reason for increased freight movement is the greater familiarity of operating men with the channel and general operating conditions. Young and active men are being attracted to river navigation and the organization is becoming more efficient from year to year. The river, having been in disuse for so many years, attracted very few men of the right caliber to the service, and it has been necessary to develop an operating force. The benefit from the volume of freight handled is enhanced by the average high class of freight, as, of course, the saving per ton is much greater on the higher classes.

#### RIVER IMPROVEMENT.

The \$4,400,000 appropriated by Congress for river improvement since the beginning of this enterprise has been expended in contracts for systematic improvement of the river between Kansas City and its mouth, a distance of 390 miles. Such sections as have been improved now have permanent channels of 6 feet and greater depth, and have very materially aided navigation. Larger contracting firms have been attracted to this work, which means a more rapid completion of the contracts, and the Government has very materially enlarged its own fleet so as to be able to accomplish a great deal more work. There remain a number of bad sections along the river which can not be improved until they are reached under the systematic continuing plan of improvement, but the elimination of the "pork barrel" means an earlier completion of the whole work at less cost to the Government.

#### PUBLIC INTEREST.

While this company is fortified with freight contracts from the larger shippers, guaranteeing a portion of their tonnage for a period of years, it has not been necessary to resort to these contracts to secure freight, and our list of shippers is gradually increasing, based on the merits of the service and the actual saving in freight rates.

#### CONCLUSION.

From the standpoint of boat service, increased operating efficiency, improvement freight handling, river improvement, and tonnage increase the development all along the line is encouraging to the point of assuring success in the restoration of river commerce in a large way, to the benefit of the Missouri Valley, Kansas City, and surrounding territory.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SAUNDERS). The time of the gentleman has expired.



Mr. BORLAND. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Will the gentleman from Washington use some of his time?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, what amazes me in this whole transaction is the docility of the House. More than six months ago we passed the river and harbor bill, three hundred and ninety odd Representatives of the people, coming directly from them and undertaking to represent them in matters of this kind.

Mr. SLOAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. Yes.

Mr. SLOAN. The gentleman speaks of the docility of the House. Does he mean in reference to this matter or the general docility of the House?

Mr. MOORE. I refer to this particular matter at this particular time, because if there has ever been an exhibition of greater docility and subservience on the part of the House than in the matter of the river and harbor bill, I have failed to observe it.

Apparently we are to yield to the dictation of another body, not to the whole body, because half of it seems to have been asleep for the whole of the six months during which the House bill was before that body. Indeed we are to yield to the dictation of only three or four men, one or two of whom knew what they were talking about, and the others of whom knew little about it, except that they had discovered something which a few of the newspapers denominated a "pork barrel." And it is a difficult thing for some men who love sensations to resist the newspapers on such a proposition.

Mr. Speaker, all river and harbor bills, since I have been a Member of this House, have been framed in substantially the same way that this river and harbor bill was framed. The representatives of the people, voicing the sentiments of their constituencies, did what they could before the House committee to obtain recognition for what they believed to be needful projects, and those projects were included in the House bill, just as they have been included from time immemorial.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Was the bill that passed in 1907 framed in the same way that this bill was; along the same lines by those who had charge of it then?

Mr. MOORE. Substantially the same. The gentleman may be putting a catch question—

Mr. McKELLAR. Not at all.

Mr. MOORE. But I want to be just as broad in this matter as though I were a Member of his side of the House. There is positively no difference between the conditions under which this river and harbor bill of 1914 was framed and the conditions under which the bill of 1907 was framed. It may be and probably is true that the party now in power took care of its own a little more than was done in the bill of 1907, but my recollection is that those sections of the country which have been fairly well recognized in this bill of 1914 were also very well taken care of in 1907. If we were to use the Mississippi River as an illustration, the stream that has taken the bulk of the appropriations, we would probably find that it was cared for by appropriation in 1907 very much as it is to-day, except that the appropriation is larger.

The House acted. It passed a bill which it was believed met the needs of the situation. It was not an unreasonable bill in amount, because the sentiment of the country had come to demand an annual river and harbor bill and the completion of work already undertaken. This bill went to the Senate; there it slumbered for six months, the majority party making no effort to pass it until the European war broke out and the cry of economy was raised. Then it was taken up in the face of those tactics which led on to filibustering "heroics," which delighted the sensational newspapers of the land.

Here and there from the great editorial sanctums came statements indicating that there was "pork" in this bill. The editors were aroused to the news features of the discussion and treated the well-known and well-worn river and harbor facts as a revelation. Unmindful of the history of river and harbor bills, they helped along the general fund of misinformation.

The Senate finally sent the bill back, but in such form that it is practically an instruction to the House to pass it as the Senate indicates. They had six months on the other side to con-

sider it, six months to cull it and disarm it, if it had anything in it that was improper, but they sent it back without analyzing a single item or permitting a single item to stand. The Senate dispenses with the House bill in toto and submits an amendment providing for a lump-sum appropriation. If the House accepts the Senate amendment, it takes away from both bodies, the Senate and the House, all right to appropriate the public funds for rivers and harbors. An administrative body is given full power in the amendment to appropriate the money of the Government. The legislative body, which is empowered by the Constitution to exercise legislative functions, delegates its power to one of the executive departments. More than that, it specifies the Corps of Engineers to have exclusive jurisdiction over a lump sum, and thus subjects it to all of the embarrassments that result from logrolling and political influence, which perhaps are just as vicious in their way as is what is commonly called the "pork barrel." The Senate amendment does not correct the so-called "pork barrel"; it merely transfers the matter of rivers and harbors from an alleged "pork-barrel" system to a new system of logrolling and political influence, which must now be withstood by one of the departments. [Applause.] In other words, the Congress of the United States will have abdicated its power and will have itself submitted to a voluntary infraction of the Constitution of the United States if it passes this amendment as the Senate undertakes to cram it down our throats.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that any man is going to make a great reputation from long night sessions or sleepless filibusters if he destroys what the people of this country want. [Applause.] I am satisfied that the people of the country, whether the party in power is erring in this respect or not, want a river and harbor bill, because it represents inland transportation competition with railroad transportation, because it means more economic living, and because it is calculated to develop trade and commerce which now lie dormant in many instances, due to the inaction of Congress. The amount of money expended on rivers and harbors in the United States is insignificant compared with what is expended by other countries. The single State of New York, over yonder, has expended more than \$140,000,000 upon one canal of its own, and that \$140,000,000 is as much as the whole Government of the United States had expended up to 1907 on all of the rivers and harbors in all of the States along the Atlantic seaboard from Maine to Florida, east of the Appalachian chain, since the beginning of our history.

At the single port of New York we take in in customs every year \$210,000,000, which is distributed to the entire country for various purposes, and some of it surely should find its way into those internal improvements which tend to promote trade in all the States.

Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from a very unusual convention that had something to say on this subject, a convention along the Hudson Valley, where the people turned out in great numbers because they learned that Congress proposed to stop work upon certain projects already begun. They lined the river banks on either side for 150 miles; whole cities poured out their residents, who gave open and earnest expression of protest against the failure of a river and harbor bill this year. And why? Up yonder in New York State, between Albany and Troy, a distance of 6 miles, and a little below Albany, is a barrier to commerce. The State of New York has expended its \$140,000,000 bringing the Great Lakes from Duluth and Chicago and Detroit down to the Atlantic Ocean through hundreds of miles of canalization.

The Government has made a belated effort to deepen the Hudson River from the Atlantic Ocean to Troy and Albany to connect with this great barge system across the State to the Great Lakes. There on Friday last was presented to the people of this country, particularly to those who were so unfortunate as to see it, a spectacle that ought to make American Congressmen ashamed. A torpedo boat of the Government, one of the lightest in draft, going 150 miles up the Hudson River with the view of reaching the approach to the New York State Barge Canal, was stuck in the mud. It could not move because the appropriations of Congress had failed to keep the channel clear. One hundred and fifty miles this side to the ocean, hundreds of miles already improved by a single State to the west, all waiting to be connected, and yet a small intervening barrier which this Government has failed to remove blocks it all. It is a shame; and yet, sitting in 25-story skyscrapers in New York, we have seen great editors writing editorials approving the filibusters and giving out sensational statements to all the people that because of a "pork barrel" a rivers and harbors bill should not pass. [Applause.] The people of the Hudson Valley set some fires under those editorial offices, they set some fires under the magazine writers, and I question whether they will be quite so conspicuous hereafter in cutting out their own

appropriations in New York and up the Hudson as they have been heretofore.

It may be, Mr. Speaker, that certain sections of the country were favored in this bill. The party in power being voted into power by the people doubtless did take care of itself. I have been one of those on the Republican side who has not found fault with the party in power for taking "its own" when it could get it. I have rather expected it would, but I do believe without regard to politics that every dollar spent upon river and harbor improvements in this country has been well spent. [Applause.] While I object to abdicating my place here as a Member of Congress and dedicating to an administrative officer the law-making power the people conferred upon me, though I have every confidence in the Army engineers and will sing their praise as loud as any, I object to and I protest against the senatorial action which puts that body of engineers in charge of the distribution of public money without regard to Congress. [Applause.]

I believe that rivers and harbors money is well spent. Instances could be cited without number to prove the return the Government gets out of every dollar it spends in this way. Over on the Delaware River in my State work has been stopped. The dredges have been taken off because, perchance, some gentlemen in the Senate and possibly some in the House have been indulging in a filibuster with a view to stopping appropriations. What is the result? The river is beginning to fill up. It collects in customs receipts for the Government approximately \$20,000,000 a year. It must be maintained. No highway was ever built of macadam or of concrete that did not have to be repaired. No house was ever constructed that did not have to be cleaned. No river will ever be dredged without having to be maintained, and the man who insists that maintenance is costly and seeks to stop work on that account simply does not know the ordinary necessities of conducting a great business. The channel must be cleared. The clearing of the channel must be paid for. Obstructions will form, and they must be removed, and this costs money.

I say it costs money to clear away the obstructions in channels; it costs money to connect rivers by canalization; it costs money to dredge out harbors, but if we do not dredge out New York, if we do not dredge out Portland, if we do not dredge out Philadelphia, if we do not dredge out Boston or Savannah, we do not get the returns into the coffers of the United States that modern civilization and modern business methods require. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOORE. May I have five minutes additional?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I yield the gentleman five minutes additional.

Mr. MOORE. And if we do not spend money, pray what becomes of it? It does no good to hoard it. In the present instance by stopping the expenditure of money upon rivers and harbors the filibusters have accomplished two things. Where we had contract work the contractors have had to discharge their men and get off the job and there has been great waste and loss resulting from it. Over at Troy, on the Hudson, a great dam, intended to complete the work connecting the commerce between the Great Lakes and the Hudson River has been stopped in midstream. The waters are rushing by and disintegration is taking place. That is what filibustering brings in its wake when Congress indulges it. Over yonder in the Delaware, of which I have knowledge, the stream is silting up. That is what filibustering brings to the Government and to us. It is the same story at the mouth of the Columbia on the Pacific. Work has been stopped and loss sets in. If a contractor discharges his men and they go off and look for work elsewhere, especially at this time, when men are in need of work, what becomes of the Government employees? I am informed there are about 30,000 men altogether engaged in river and harbor work. Many of these have already been turned aside. The working organization of the Government to a certain extent has been disorganized. What good has been done must stop temporarily. It will take time and money to pick it up again. It is not an extravagance to say that if no river and harbor bill is passed by this session of Congress there will be at least 200,000 souls that have depended upon the breadwinners employed upon river and harbor work that may have to look elsewhere for support. This is another achievement of the filibusterers.

Mr. Speaker, the money that is spent, even if some of it goes as "pork" to a little stream, in the river and harbor bill is spent in this country, thank God, and goes into circulation amongst our own people. It is not lost. [Applause.] But it is lost to our own people when we spend it in the building of

foreign ships or the buying of foreign ships at the expense of our own industries. The money we spend upon rivers and harbors of this country is spent upon ourselves, and the main question is to see that it is fairly and wisely apportioned.

As an advocate of improved waterways in this country, I do not desire to see the river and harbor bill fail. If, however, I dealt with this question only as an agitator, I might regard it as good politics to have it fail, because if all work should be suddenly stopped, there would be such an uprising of men and women engaged in trade and commerce in this country as would bring to Congress an expression of the will of the people that could not be forgotten. It would lead to some prompt and systematic method by which hereafter the Government would take care of its own enterprises.

But, Mr. Speaker, I dislike to encourage waste. I would rather have a crumb than no bread at all; and even if we are to be crowded to the wall, even if our prerogative as legislators is to be taken away, even if the Senate is to force the House to admit that everything above \$20,000,000 in its original policy is "pork barrel" and graft, even if there is to be a confession by the party in power that it yields under fire, I am about ready to take what will come, so that at least some men in this country may have employment and at least some of the uncompleted projects may go on and the waste due to a needless filibuster may stop. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN].

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, like the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE], I, too, have been impressed by the docility of this House in the present consideration of this bill. I had asked for a few moments in order to offer an amendment, but I understand that a colleague from Massachusetts has in mind the same amendment to offer, and as he is a member of the committee which has this bill in charge, I shall defer to him. Of course it is an amendment which we hope may bring some good to Boston Harbor.

While I am on my feet I want to call to the attention of this House the fact that the Commonwealth of Massachusetts to-day is spending \$11,000,000 of its own money on the development of the port of Boston. We have been told that altruism with regard to port development is that each port should have a channel suitable to the kind of vessels which are attracted and in service to it. Now, if Boston merely had the freighters or the tramp steamers drawing 25 feet or so of water, of course she would not need 40 feet in her channel. But Boston has the combination passenger and freight boats, the big boats, in fact. And I know this House will be surprised to learn that of the 172 commercial vessels in the whole world 500 feet and over, during 1913, 27 of those vessels were in service in Boston. In short, almost one-sixth of the vessels of the world 500 feet long and over were in service in our harbor.

In the last 40 years the State of Massachusetts has contributed most generously. The port directors of Boston have \$4,000,000 to spend on the development of that harbor, and they ask the cooperation of the Federal Government. Why, Mr. Chairman, the largest dry dock in the world is in the course of construction at Boston at the present day. It is to be 1,200 feet long, 150 feet wide, and able to accommodate the largest vessels afloat or projected. There is not a dry dock on the Atlantic coast big enough to take several of the largest steamships now coming to our ports.

It is not fair to Boston and it is not fair to the steamship companies when they put in service to Boston a vessel capable of loading to 34 feet that the ship can only be loaded to 31 feet at the most, for the difference of 3 feet in vessels of the type in service to Boston would carry practically one-third more cargo with comparatively little increase of cost for operation, and this 3 feet either makes it profitable or unprofitable for that ship to trade to Boston.

The 35-foot channel at Boston is only the equivalent of a 30-foot channel or less, for at low tide, with an off-shore wind, there is a minus tide of 2 or 3 feet which brings the 35-foot channel down to 32 or 33 feet.

A vessel under way has a "squat" in the water of about 3 feet, bringing the 33-foot channel down to 30 feet, so far as this vessel is concerned, and the boat should be entitled at least to a couple of feet more under her keel as a matter of safety, which still further reduces the available depth to 28 feet.

Fourteen of the trans-Atlantic lines at Boston carry passengers varying from a few hundred to a few thousand, and, as a matter of safety, the channel should be deepened, and also, as a matter of expedition, for Boston's nearness to Europe of 190 miles, as against the nearest Atlantic port to the south (New



York). is appreciably diminished if the boats at Boston must wait for the tide to enter or leave port.

It is not fair to Boston to have such conditions exist, particularly when the State of Massachusetts is spending millions to develop the port of Boston and particularly when so much of the prosperity of New England and the very life of the industries there depend upon the speedy, cheap transportation facilities best supplied by the big combination passenger and freight boats.

The 1912 report of the Rotterdam Chamber of Commerce and the March, 1914, publication from the Port of London Authority, giving the net tonnage of shipping entering the various ports, prove that Boston is now the second port in North or South America and the fifth largest in the entire world.

The latest figures obtainable are those for 1912, and show the net tonnage of shipping, foreign and coastwise, entering the ports to be as follows:

New York (estimated).....	22,367,103
London.....	16,561,994
Hamburg.....	13,797,009
Rotterdam.....	12,094,030
Boston.....	11,755,071
Antwerp.....	11,698,000
Liverpool.....	10,590,291

The port of Boston, following closely after New York, London, Hamburg, and Rotterdam, now outranks such world-wide ports as Antwerp and Liverpool.

Boston in 1912 had 3,061,733 net tons of shipping in the foreign trade and 8,693,338 net tons of shipping in the coastwise trade, making a total of 11,755,071.

This was still further increased in 1913 to 12,182,759 net tons, a gain of 427,688 net tons of shipping in one year.

The foreign trade of the port last year was \$260,482,097, a gain of \$25,563,122 over 1912.

Of this \$260,000,000, \$85,712,088 was exports and \$174,770,009 was imports, foreign and domestic; \$44,332,457 was Canadian business.

The port of Boston has more than contributed her share to the running expenses of the Federal Government, providing an average of \$25,000,000 a year for the past six years.

The customs dues collected at Boston in 1913 were \$23,789,690.82.

Boston has 49 steamship lines, foreign and coastwise, to and from all parts of the world.

Thirty-five of these lines are in the foreign trade running to and from Liverpool, London, Manchester, Glasgow, Hull, Fowey, Antwerp, Rotterdam, Hamburg, Bremen, Copenhagen, Libau, Christiania and Gothenburg, Trieste and Adriatic ports, Barcelona and Almeria, the Mediterranean, Calcutta and the East Indies, China, Japan, the Philippines and the Far East, New Zealand and Australia, South American ports, the River Plate, Central America, the West Indies, Habana, Cuban ports, Porto Rico, and St. John, New Brunswick; Yarmouth and Halifax, Nova Scotia; and the Canadian Provinces.

Fourteen of these lines are in the coastwise trade to State of Maine ports; New York; Philadelphia; Baltimore; Norfolk; Newport News; Charleston, S. C.; Savannah, Ga.; Jacksonville, Fla.; and two through the Panama Canal to Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Puget Sound ports.

The steamship lines trading to Boston in the foreign trade are the Cunard, Leyland, White Star, Warren, Allan, Wilson, Furness, Red Star, Holland-America, Hamburg-American, North German Lloyd, Scandinavian-American, Russian-American, Sweden-Norway, Austro-American, Spanish-American, Italian, American-Indian, American-Manchurian, American-Oriental, Federal-Shire, Barber, Houston, United Fruit, Habana, Munson, United States Shipping, Porto Rican, International, Yarmouth, and Plant.

In the coastwise trade are the Eastern Steamship Co., the Maine Coast Steamship Co., the Metropolitan, the Merchants & Miners, the Ocean Steamship Co., the Clyde Line, and through the Panama Canal the Boston-Pacific and the American-Hawaiian Lines.

There were at the port of Boston last year 106 boats from Liverpool; 26 from London; 25 from Manchester; 25 from Glasgow; 21 from Hull; 26 from Antwerp; 25 from Rotterdam; 40 from Hamburg; 5 from Bremen (new service); 21 from Copenhagen; 2 from Libau (new service); 18 from the Mediterranean; 73 from Central America; 52 from the West Indies; 13 from Habana; 157 from St. John, New Brunswick; 172 from Yarmouth; 67 from Halifax; 6 from Fowey, England; 17 from South America; 46 from Calcutta and the East Indies; 26 from China, Japan, the Philippines, the Far East, and so forth; in addition to the immense coastwise traffic.

The trans-Atlantic passenger business of the port of Boston last year was 134,315, a gain of 28,652 over 1912 and a gain of 38,053 over 1911.

There were also 1,600 Central American and West Indian passengers, 134,000 Canadian passengers, and about 408,000 coastwise passengers.

These, together with about 22,000,000 excursion passengers, make a total of about 22,677,915 people who used the port of Boston last year.

The port of Boston has 141 miles of linear water front, extending from Point Shirley in Winthrop on the north to Point Allerton in Hull on the south. Forty miles of this 141 is used commercially, of which about 10 miles is located in Boston proper.

The harbor has a water area of 47 square miles (30,000 acres), not including the islands.

The State of Massachusetts in the past 40 years has cooperated with the Federal Government to the extent of \$10,787,262.12, of which \$5,408,138.79 was spent under the jurisdiction of the State harbor and land commission from 1870 to 1911 and \$5,381,123.33 by the directors of the port of Boston from 1911 to date, September 1, 1914.

The port directors have still some \$4,000,000 to spend, and trust that the Federal Government will so cooperate in the matter of a 40-foot channel, that it may be invested to the best possible advantage.

The largest dry dock in the world is under course of construction at Boston, 1,200 feet long, 150 feet wide, able to accommodate the largest vessel afloat or projected. There is not a dry dock on the Atlantic coast big enough to take several of the large steamships now coming to this country, and the port of Boston is providing the necessary facilities to accommodate them, and it is the function of the Federal Government to provide the necessary depths of channels to allow these vessels to take advantage of these facilities, both in fairness to the port of Boston for providing them and in fairness to the boats in case of accident.

In the year preceding the adoption of a 40-foot channel project for New York Harbor, 1898, there were in service to that port only 9 steamers drawing 30 feet or over, with a maximum of 32 feet, and the largest vessel in prospect was to draw 33 feet.

At Boston last year 20 vessels drawing 30 feet and over entered or left the port. (Figures from the pilot commissioners of Boston.)

And so, judging from figures, Boston is twice as much entitled to a 40-foot channel now as New York was 15 years ago.

And again, a 40-foot channel authorized now will not be ready for 15 years, at which time it will undoubtedly be small enough.

Since the port directors were established in 1911 the shipping tonnage of the port has increased 5 per cent, the foreign trade of the port over 13 per cent, the trans-Atlantic passenger business over 43 per cent, and the number of steamship lines over 22 per cent.

The port directors have been working for a deeper channel for Boston since December, 1911, almost three years. The project has successfully passed every stage and investigation, until now it is before Congress, and the United States Government should cooperate at the port of Boston by giving Boston a 40-foot channel, the same as New York.

The board of port directors is composed of three of the ablest men in public life in Massachusetts. Its chairman, the Hon. Edward F. McSweeney, has held many public positions, and has recently, at the urgent request of our distinguished governor, the Hon. David L. Walsh, undertaken the work of further developing our harbor facilities. He is a man who does not limit himself to "office hours" when he accepts a commission from our Commonwealth. Day and night, with every ounce of energy and enthusiasm at his control, he is working to make the port of Boston what it should have been years ago. His two valued assistants, the Hon. Joseph A. Conry, a former Member of Congress, and the Hon. Lombard Williams, a former leader in our State senate, are by his side cooperating in every way possible so that the millions which the Commonwealth has appropriated may be expended honestly, wisely, and most advantageously.

As a Representative of Boston and Massachusetts I ask this body to fairly consider our claims. I ask you to cooperate with our people, who have at last awakened to the possibilities before them. Boston and the old Bay State seek no "pork-barrel" gifts, but want your help in a necessary and most urgent undertaking. Give us your aid now. [Applause.]

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL].

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Speaker, while the amendment or substitute adopted by the Senate and recommended by the House committee has been explained to the House, it may be well to recur to it again briefly. It provides a lump appropriation of \$20,000,000, to be expended, first, in the preservation of existing projects and also in the prosecution of the projects which have been heretofore adopted by Congress. Some of these projects already adopted are prosecuted directly by the engineers and others by contractors. All new projects carried in the bill as it passed the House are eliminated, and no surveys are carried in the pending amendment. I think there is no difference between the Members upon either side of the House as to their attitude toward this amendment. The objections which have been urged are well founded. It is a bad precedent—bad legislation—and will come up in the future to plague this body in future appropriation bills. So, therefore, I suppose if every friend of the improvement of our waterways would consult his individual judgment about the matter he would vote against the adoption of the amendment passed by the other body. But there is another consideration. If no appropriation is made at this session of Congress, there are many improvements underway the condition of which is so urgent and as to which deterioration will be so great, both as to the equipment and as to the work in progress, as to result in the loss of hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of dollars during the ensuing few months. I might mention one improvement which comes to my mind at the present time, namely, the upper Hudson River. During 1915 the great Barge Canal in New York, with a minimum depth of 12 feet, will have been completed. It can not be operated unless the dam at Troy, undertaken by the Government, is completed contemporaneously, and it is exceedingly important that that work shall have an immediate allotment or appropriation in order that the work of construction may proceed. The same may be said as to the improvement of the upper Hudson, particularly between Albany and the Troy Dam.

So there are other improvements throughout the country which are equally as urgent, and I think it is the duty of every Member of this House who believes in the improvement of waterways as the handmaid of commerce to vote for this bill, if for no other reason than that expressed by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND], because it is the lesser of two evils.

I deplore some little manifestation to-day of a partisan spirit in the consideration of this bill. I have heard it frequently stated by Members of long service on the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and other Members of this House that there has been heretofore nothing partisan in the formulation of river and harbor bills or in their consideration. I know during the time in which I have seen service on the committee that there has never at any time been introduced a partisan or sectional reason for the approval or rejection of any item of improvement, and I hope that this disposition, slight as it may be, that has been manifested to-day may not find lodgment in the minds of the membership of the House.

Mr. Speaker, having made this brief reference to this amendment, I desire to talk briefly on the general subject of our waterways. One gentleman well said that in transportation is involved the prosperity of our country, because upon it rests in part the development and growth of our domestic commerce. It also is important in that it affects our foreign trade. One of the most important economic problems before the American people to-day is the extension of our oversea trade. That extension depends upon the extent to which we put ourselves in a competitive condition with respect to other countries. With cheaper transportation we can cheapen the cost of production, so that both in domestic and foreign trade transportation is the very lifeblood of our commerce. The development of our harbors and our interior waterways ought to impress every Member of the Congress.

In former years the volume of appropriations and the tendency of improvements were largely toward the harbors. Perhaps that was necessary at that time. Perhaps, also, the fact that these harbors were terminals of great trunk lines of railroads may have had influence. But the trend of opinion throughout the entire country for some years has been toward the improvement of our interior waterways, and this bill, as it was formulated and presented to the House by the committee, was, in my opinion, superior to any bill that has heretofore been presented, certainly as good as any during the last few years, in that it recognized in a large way—not overgenerous, but still in a proper way—the necessity of the improvement of these interior waterways. And among these interior waterways not the least important are streams which in themselves may seem insignificant. What may be termed a creek, and yet constituting the only means of transportation for the community which it serves,

is just as worthy of an appropriation and being improved as are the larger projects.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMALL. In just one minute. And in the main the appropriations for these small streams affect as large a volume of commerce and, in many instances, larger than those for longer and more important waterways. Now I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MOORE. The old-time sailing vessel is rapidly disappearing from the high seas, is it not?

Mr. SMALL. It is.

Mr. MOORE. And the motor boat and the barge have come very extensively into use in inland waters, so that to a very great extent, on a coast line like that of the Atlantic, the inland waterways are useful in carrying trade and commerce in a new form of craft which is rapidly developing?

Mr. SMALL. The gentleman is entirely right. The trend is along the line of developing barge transportation, improved types of self-propelled barges or exclusive freighters, in order to reduce the cost of transportation to the minimum.

Now, it is not my purpose to discuss any particular project in these remarks, both because it is not necessary in the consideration of this bill and because I wish to discuss in a general way the relation of waterways to our commerce and to our progress. The critics of river and harbor legislation have not always taken the trouble to inform themselves as to the facts or the premises upon which the improvements are demanded or based, and that has been particularly true in respect to some of the periodicals and newspapers of the country. Of course I would not have the temerity or the discourtesy to suggest that any distinguished Member of this House who had criticized river and harbor appropriations was not fully informed. Even if it were so, a Member soon finds that criticisms which are not based upon worthy motives or upon correct statements of fact redound to his discredit more than they injure any proposition before this House.

I agree with some of the critics to this extent, that some of our interior waterways have not developed the volume of commerce which their improvement would justify; and I think that if critics of the improvement of our waterways would devote more of their efforts toward uniting with other friends who seek the promotion of our commerce upon these waterways, they would render a higher service to the country.

I wish to discuss two or three elements which are necessary in the development of commerce upon these waterways. First is the introduction of a better type of carrier. We must study the carriers which are in use on the waterways of continental Europe with reference not only to the cost of operation but also as to the cost of construction, with a view to developing a type of barge or exclusive freighter which in cost of construction and operation shall enable us to reach the minimum of cost in carriage.

Another necessity lies in the provision of terminals at all our harbors and on all our interior waterways. The development of commerce absolutely depends upon the construction of terminals. These ought not to be a burden upon the General Government, but ought to be constructed at the expense of the localities, preferably the States or the municipalities contiguous to the waterways. The terminals are just as necessary to the waterways as they are to railroads, and I am glad to say that our committee two years ago included in the bill which was then passed a provision directing the engineers to investigate the condition of terminals and the absence of terminals at all the ports and cities and landings upon our interior waterways, and that investigation has been completed by the engineers and its results published in a large volume, which contains a fund of information which the student will find most interesting.

These terminals should have ample water fronts and capacious warehouses and facilities for unloading and loading freight with the greatest expedition and at the least cost. They should be constructed and owned by the municipality as a representative of the public, and in addition they should be physically connected by rail with the railroad or railroads serving the community which is contiguous to the waterway. These belt lines of railroad should be owned by the public, and the use of them should be given to the several lines of railroad upon fair terms, yet at such a price as will yield some revenue to the municipality. I believe the time is soon coming when Congress ought to make its appropriations for waterways conditioned upon the public providing or assuming the construction of terminals which shall answer the demands of commerce, because it is not the function of the Federal Government to improve channels unless there shall be developed in those channels a reasonable amount of commerce commensurate with the appropriation.



In addition, the development of our commerce upon our waterways depends upon a system of prorating between water carriers and rail carriers. There was a time in the United States when the tracks of railroads were not standardized, when cars were not standardized, so that there had to be a transfer of freight at the terminal of the respective railroads where freight was carried over the lines of more than one road. To-day not only has there been this standardization of track and of cars, but there is a system of prorating between the railroads of the country, so that the shipper at the most remote point in the United States may go to the agent of his railroad and secure a rate of transportation and a through bill of lading to the most distant point in the country, even though in the meantime it should be carried over six or a dozen different lines of railroad. Contending as we do, and as every student admits, that transportation by water is the cheapest method of transportation known, every opportunity should be afforded to shippers to take advantage of the cheap rates by water, and where freight is to be carried partly by water and partly by rail, the shipper is of right entitled to go to the railroad, if the freight must first be shipped upon a line of road, or to the agent of the water carrier if the conditions are reversed, and secure a through rate by the water carrier and the railroad and a through bill of lading to the point of destination. In the Panama Canal act passed in 1912 there was a general provision conferring jurisdiction upon the Interstate Commerce Commission to establish and enforce such a system of prorating. Owing in part to opposition from the railroads and to indifference or lack of knowledge of the necessity for it upon the part of the water carriers, this system of prorating between water carriers and railroads has not yet had general introduction. But the development of water carriers, the growth of commerce upon our interior waterways, will not secure its full fruition, growth, and development until such a system of prorating is established and maintained between water carriers and rail carriers, in the interest of the man who does the shipping and who pays the freight.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAY). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman five minutes more.

Mr. SMALL. So, Mr. Speaker, admitting, as we all do, that water transportation is the cheapest method of movement, admitting, as we all do, that the development of water-borne commerce is involved essentially in the progress and prosperity of our country, we must give greater attention in the future to these conditions upon which the development of water-borne commerce depends. One of the grounds of criticism which we frequently hear of projects of river and harbor appropriation is the citation of interior waterways upon which no adequate movement of commerce has developed. It may have been a sufficient answer in the past to have replied that the improvement of such waterways had regulated and reduced freight rates by rail. Valuable as such a result may be—and I do not minimize its value—the time has come when that result alone is not a sufficient justification of appropriations for the deepening of channels or the improvement otherwise of our interior waterways, and we must secure an improved type of carrier, suitable to the respective localities. We must insist that there shall be local cooperation to the extent of providing adequate water terminals, and we must further insist on educating the shipping public, to the end that there shall be prorating, not only as between different lines of water carriers but as between water carriers and railways, so that the shipper may take advantage of the low rate by water and secure the transfer of his freight from the water carrier to the railroad car through the facilities of the water terminal, expeditiously and cheaply; and thus, through these three conditions, make for the development of our water-borne commerce and remove the only justifiable criticism which has been urged against this improvement of our waterways.

I repeat again that if the critics of the appropriations for these improvements will join hands with those who are seeking to promote water-borne commerce and aid in promoting the conditions which will make for the greatest development of transportation by water, they will serve in large degree, and more effectively than they are serving now, the best interests of the people of the entire country. [Applause.]

I yield back any time I may not have used.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman yields back one minute.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GALLAGHER].

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I have no set speech and no prepared argument upon this Senate amendment. I agree fully with what my friend from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL] said a little while ago about the necessity for waterway improvements, but I disagree with him when he says that he will not attempt to talk about the amendment because the amendment has been fully explained. I would like to hear somebody stand up here and explain what the Senate amendment means. I would like to have somebody tell where this money is going to be expended and upon what projects it is going to be expended, and what improvement is intended to be made by it. I do not believe there is anybody in this House who can tell where the money is going. I would like to know something about it before I vote to pass any such measure in this House.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, assuming that the gentleman is directing his question to me, I wish to say that, of course, there are no particular projects mentioned in this amendment, but I can easily inform him as to the classes of projects upon which the appropriation will be expended.

Mr. GALLAGHER. The gentleman does not need to do that. I know all about that myself.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I would like to know, then, why the gentleman asked the question?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I know what class of projects this money will be spent upon, and I think the gentlemen at the other end of this building knew very nearly upon what projects the money will be spent when they agreed to pass such an amendment in the Senate, but I know there is nobody who can tell offhand where a dollar of this money is going.

For that reason we of the committee wanted to have the engineers come in and tell us where they were going to spend the money, upon what projects it was necessary to spend the money to maintain them, and upon what projects we should appropriate money to protect them so that the Government would not suffer loss.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLAGHER. Certainly.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Perhaps I can be a little more definite than my suggestion a moment ago indicated. The money will be expended, in so far as it is necessary, in the prosecution of work that can be done between now and the 4th of March next upon adopted projects not heretofore completed, and also upon projects upon which maintenance is necessary.

Mr. GALLAGHER. We ascertained, when we tried to find out yesterday for what projects money would be needed, that it would be necessary to wait for three or four weeks, or possibly six weeks, before the engineers could report anything about it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wish to say that the gentleman is entirely mistaken about that; there was no statement made before the committee like that. The gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. GALLAGHER. That is the way I understood it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is the trouble with the gentleman; I fear he often misunderstands.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Not very often. I understand this amendment, and it is because I think I fully understand it that I am standing up here and kicking against it. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. SPARKMAN. What I said was that the engineers could not at this time tell how much they could expend on any particular project mentioned or referred to in this provision; that they would have to send to the district engineers to get a statement from them, which I said I was informed would require two or three weeks; and they will have to do that, anyway, before they allot much of this money.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I do not care to go into any argument with the chairman of the committee on this proposition, as I think he really feels at heart the same as I do about the whole matter. I propose to make a statement to the Members of the House as to the situation confronting the House. I do not expect to make many converts on that side of the House.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Has the gentleman gone over to the other side?

Mr. GALLAGHER. No; but I am going to give my reasons, because there is such a large attendance on our side of the House and so much inattention that I am afraid a large part of what I have to say will not be heard by many Members, and I may be unable to make many converts on that side of the aisle.

I am in favor of waterway improvement, and I was also in favor of the bill reported by the committee. I did not have much to do with the making up of the bill. I was absent a great deal of the time on account of sickness in my family; but I had served long enough with the members of the committee to believe that they were sincere in trying to develop our waterways,



improve the streams, and bring increased commerce to our rivers and harbors. I agreed to support the bill as it was passed in this House.

Now, I am not opposed in any way to the bill that the House adopted, and I do not believe that the people are dissatisfied with the bill. I do not believe that there was such an amount of pork as some people would try to make us believe; in fact, I do not believe that there was any pork in the bill whatever. I wish I could say that much for this amendment that is presented here to-day.

Now, the papers in New York had a great deal to say about the pork-barrel measure, and that bill carried a very substantial appropriation for New York Harbor. Some of the Democratic representatives of New York City were here the other day crying out for money to carry on improvements in New York Harbor. Of course there is no pork in the improvements they wanted; the pork must be in some other part of the country. The papers in Philadelphia—and Philadelphia, God knows, has been well taken care of by river and harbor appropriations—the papers of Philadelphia called it a thieves' bill and a grafters' bill, and yet they had a very substantial appropriation for the Delaware River and Philadelphia Harbor.

Mr. DONOHUE. I presume when the gentleman says Philadelphia has been well taken care of he means in recent years.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Oh, yes; the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania is on the job most of the time when improvements are wanted for his city. There was no "pork" in the bill as far as Philadelphia was concerned. The "pork" was somewhere else. The Boston papers termed it a "pork-barrel" bill, and our Democratic colleagues from Boston told us to-day that they needed money for improvement of the Boston Harbor. There was no "pork" in the bill for Boston. It must be for some other place. The papers in Washington, on the Pacific coast, said that there was a lot of "pork" in the bill. Now they find out that they can not get an appropriation for the Columbia River and other projects in that State. Now, there was no "pork" in the bill for Washington; it was some other place. And so it is all over the country.

Now, this bill or this amendment which you propose to act upon this afternoon turns over \$20,000,000 to the engineers to parcel out as they see fit, subject to orders of the Secretary of War. I have had enough experience around this Capitol to know that if there is any influence to be exercised upon the Secretary of War or upon any of the heads of the great departments, the very potent influence does not come from Members of this body. It will probably be exercised by gentlemen at the other end of the building; and they must know, or there must have been some understanding about this matter, when they could agree, after all of the abuse that was heaped upon the river and harbor bill over there—they must have known, or do know, or have some understanding, where this \$20,000,000 is going to be spent.

I am not going to vote and allow them to carry out anything other than what I think is right, believing it is our duty to know where the money shall be spent and for what purpose it shall be spent. I do not propose to abrogate any right that I have or to allow myself to be convinced that the people over on the Senate side know any more about where money should be spent or is needed than I do. We sent the bill there early in the spring and the bill lay over there nearly all summer.

Then they took it up, and in a quarrel among themselves abused the bill and everything in it, and finally decided that the best way to settle the matter would be to make a lump appropriation and let the Secretary of War parcel it out. If you want to do that, go ahead and vote for this bill. I do not. If you are satisfied that that is the way to spend the money of the people, go ahead and spend it; but I do not believe, in the face of the arguments that have been made in this House over the war-tax measure and on account of the condition of the Treasury, due to the falling off of revenues, and of having passed a bill to tax the people for \$105,000,000, that we ought to go to work and squander \$20,000,000 or vote \$20,000,000 of the people's money for intended improvements upon rivers and harbors when we really do not know for what projects it is intended to spend the money. I am against the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR].

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Speaker, six months ago a river and harbor bill passed the House carrying over \$43,000,000. The bill further authorized new projects which, apart from cash included in the 1914 appropriation, created an additional obligation of over \$32,000,000, or a total of more than \$75,000,000. The bill was opposed in the House, but not enough votes could be secured

against it to secure a single roll call. All proposed amendments were voted down, although facts were presented to the House based on Army engineers' reports that disclosed the wasteful character of a large number of the projects.

Thereafter the sundry civil bill was passed and became a law, carrying \$6,990,000 in various river and harbor projects.

The regular bill of \$43,289,004 cash was taken up by the Senate committee, and several of the vicious projects contained in the bill were stricken out by that committee, including Mattawan Creek, the Kissimmee and Oklawaha Rivers. In all, it was an eventual saving in expenditures of nearly a million dollars. However, the Senate committee, after making such deductions, proceeded to add over \$10,000,000 to the bill, so when reported to the Senate it carried over \$53,000,000, which, together with over \$32,000,000 in new projects and appropriations carried by the sundry civil bill, reached, in all, over \$85,000,000 for rivers and harbors in 1914. The history of the bill's stormy road in the Senate is recent history. It was finally defeated, and the substitute amendment, drawn by Senator BURTON and introduced by Senator BANKHEAD, was passed at \$20,000,000 in a lump sum, to be apportioned among the different localities as was deemed advisable under the authority of the Secretary of War and Board of Engineers.

#### AMOUNT NOW AVAILABLE FOR WATERWAYS.

From the report of the Secretary of War, in response to a Senate resolution, it appears that on June 30, 1914, there was an unexpended balance from previous appropriations for rivers and harbors of \$45,338,653. Just what portion of this can be expended on existing projects is in dispute; but whatever the amount may be, it is in addition to the \$6,990,000 already appropriated by the sundry civil bill and the \$20,000,000 carried by the Senate substitute, now before the House.

The gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] has offered an amendment of \$5,000,000 to the Senate substitute. The question under discussion is, Shall the amendment reducing the substitute to \$5,000,000 be agreed to?

By passing the substitute the Senate bill, which in present and future expenditures begun this year amounted to about \$86,000,000, will be cut \$66,000,000; and if the amendment of the gentleman from Washington is accepted, it will be a further saving of \$15,000,000, or a total reduction of \$81,000,000 in the Senate bill as reported to that body.

From all we can learn, \$5,000,000, in addition to the \$6,990,000 carried by the sundry civil bill and balance available from the \$45,000,000 of unexpended appropriations, will continue work on necessary projects, particularly at a time when a \$100,000,000 war tax in time of peace is being levied to care for extravagant expenditures for other purposes.

For this reason I favor the amendment, and hope it will pass.

#### DECEPTIVE TONNAGE STATISTICS.

A few words additional may properly be said at this time, because the temporary defeat of the overloaded river and harbor bill will not be a permanent saving unless future appropriations are kept within reasonable limits. It has been the practice of waterway enthusiasts who seek to secure favor for any particular project or for the whole bill to speak of the tonnage carried on the particular river, harbor, or creek and to thereby try and justify Government expenditures.

Such efforts have been undertaken in the present discussion. A fact is offered for your consideration on this point which I can only briefly suggest without attempting to discuss.

Whenever a bill is presented we are given tonnages from all ports of the country, whether subject to recent improvements or not, and the tonnage of the ocean and lake ports is used to swell a rapidly diminishing river traffic.

A brief examination of the subject will disclose the facts. Again, river traffic is subject to many peculiar conditions that frequently discredit the deductions of Army engineers who approve commercial possibilities of projects. Only through an analysis of traffic can a fairly clear understanding be reached of its character and value.

From the best obtainable Government data we find—for instance, on the Ohio River, which carries the largest river traffic—a loss occurred of 24 per cent in seven years. Ninety per cent of all the traffic goes by open river, unaffected by the present \$63,000,000 canalization project. Four-fifths of the 10 per cent passing through locks is coal or low-grade freight, leaving approximately 2 per cent high-grade freight accommodated by the canal locks.

#### DUPLICATIONS OF FREIGHT.

On different projects connected with the Ohio River system lockage traffic is of uncertain value, because the freight on the same boat is frequently recounted at different locks, and yet



waterway orators all over the country persist in ignoring these patent facts when they are after Government appropriations.

On the upper Mississippi I have brought to the attention of the House in other remarks that receipts and shipments of the same identical freight at a river town are added together. On the Missouri River I presented tables in the April 10 Record, page 7076, showing that even under the loose methods of duplication only 34,334 tons, or 15 per cent of the total traffic, could possibly be included as important freight. Sand, wood, logs, and revetment material compose over 90 per cent of such traffic.

Logs that would better float without canal locks than with compose 90 per cent of the traffic on some of the North Carolina and other southern streams that want Government money. Other illogical or misleading statistics are used to bolster up wasteful projects, but I do not intend to discuss such general phases of the subject, although they have formed strong ground for argument during recent debates on the river and harbor bill at both ends of the Capitol. I realize, and every other Member must have discovered, that actual merit is of little consideration in determining whether or not a waterway is to be improved. It may figure in public consideration or in enthusiastic waterway conventions held throughout the country, but it is not the controlling factor.

#### CRITICISMS OF ARMY ENGINEERS.

I have been charged with undue criticism of Army engineers, and it has been suggested that Gen. Goethals is an Army engineer and his accomplishments render all others immune from criticism. To couple the name of Goethals with that of other officials who have burdened this country with hundreds of wasteful waterway projects on which millions of dollars are being spent, is to dodge behind Goethals' coat tails. Read, if you will, the criticisms of Senators BURTON, KENYON, and GALLINGER of different projects having approval of Army engineers, and find a verification of the same conclusions drawn from the same reports when the bill was before the House. A careful study of these reports will bring the same deductions from any unprejudiced jury that could be placed in possession of the facts.

Army engineers are human and subject to human weaknesses. If this be treason, then I will quote some of their foremost champions in corroboration of my statement.

That Congress does not trust the judgment of Army engineers is evidenced by statements of some of the ablest men on the Rivers and Harbors Committee presented in the RECORD for Tuesday, September 29.

In his address in this debate, Chairman SPARKMAN stated, in substance, that he did not care to abrogate the right of Congress to determine where public moneys are to be expended and turn it over to Army engineers. Nothing but dire necessity compelled him to support that proposition.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington, the able leader of the minority of the committee, said:

I am opposed to the Senate amendment for the reason, among others, that it takes away from Congress the power of saying where this money shall be expended and places it entirely in the control of the Government engineers. \* \* \* They propose to take the \$20,000,000 and place it in a lump sum and then place it where the man that can bring the most influence on the engineers will get the most money. I say that it is unjust and is unfair to those engineers who, to a certain extent, hold their positions by favor of Congress. \* \* \* This \$20,000,000 is not sufficient to take care of half of the propositions in this country, and placing upon the engineers the responsibilities under political pressure that will come in deciding as to where that money shall be expended is unjust and dangerous.

The gentleman from Washington stated a self-evident truth.

#### THE SAME INFLUENCE IS BEHIND PROPOSED PROJECTS.

A similar situation was presented when the chairman first reported the bill to the House, with a statement that many projects had been passed by Army engineers that could not be undertaken at this time, and, further, that numerous new surveys were being considered by Army engineers.

He did not then say, which is also a reasonable conclusion, that in every instance "there is placed upon engineers the responsibilities under political pressure that will come in deciding" as to what projects shall be passed and what rejected, and what policy "is unjust and dangerous."

The distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUSSELL] has said in this debate:

I agree with him [Mr. HUMPHREY] that I would much prefer that Congress should control the allotments of this money rather than that it should be done by the Secretary of War and the Government engineers.

Another able member of the committee, Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa, has given utterance in the same debate to these remarks:

Now, what will happen in case this amendment is agreed to and the bill becomes a law in its present form? The Engineer's Office will be overwhelmed by requests from Members of Congress and organizations in localities that are interested \* \* \* and sufficient pressure will be brought to bear in some cases to allot sums to projects where it is not most urgently needed in the interests of navigation.

Does not the argument apply with equal force where proposed projects are being considered by the Army engineers? If you doubt the fact, read the Engineer's report where honest, capable, underofficers are overruled when political influence is exercised on their superiors.

In the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] regarding this \$20,000,000 Senate substitute, appears this trite observation:

More than that, it specifies the Corps of Engineers have exclusive jurisdiction over a lump sum, and thus subjects it to all the embarrassments that result from logrolling and political influence, which, perhaps, are just as vicious in their way as is what is commonly called the "pork barrel."

This statement can not be successfully disputed by any Member on the floor, and the gentleman is right, beyond question.

#### THE ARMY ENGINEER HAS ENTIRE CONTROL.

That the Engineer's office will be besieged by a throng of Senators and Representatives from morning to night is probable. That the Chief of Engineers, who has been so frequently lauded by the advocates of the present system, will be hounded to death and wish he could delegate the job elsewhere is equally true. For years we have made him the sole arbiter on all projects, with power to allow and disallow, subject to no appeal. For years troops of Senators and Congressmen have traveled, hat in hand, up to the Engineer's sanctum, and after waiting patiently their turn have one and all pressed upon this distinguished official the interests of their several constituents. His powers of resistance are measured by human endurance, so that constant dropping day by day has worn out opposition. The Oklawaha, Kissimmee, Scuppernon, Trinity, and countless other questionable projects are approved. When once allowed it becomes a scramble for the Treasury. That is the beautiful system we have adopted.

In proof of my statement I make the prediction that practically every worthless project exposed by Senators GALLINGER, KENYON, and others in the list of North Carolina creeks will be taken care of by a watchful engineer's department. The Hudson River important project to connect the Great Lakes with the ocean canal through New York State will be relegated presumably with unimportant projects to a "back seat." If so, it will be added proof of the statement by defenders of the engineers that political pressure and not merit is to determine the distribution of funds just as such pressure has determined the allowance of many worthless projects.

#### IS CRITICISM INVITED BY PRESENT METHODS?

Criticism has been heard upon this floor of those who declare the river and harbor bill to be a "pork barrel." Members have denounced the press for so stating. Gentlemen at both ends of the Capitol have grown red in the face and demanded proof that this is a "pork barrel." Listening with ears that will not hear, looking with eyes that will not see, such gentlemen profess to know nothing about a pork barrel. No one is deceived. No one is fooled. The press of the country has mercilessly dissected the bill and the specious arguments offered in its defense. From all parts of the country has come denunciation of the worst pork barrel ever offered to Congress. The press generally reflects public sentiment. Occasionally a paper represents some special interest, but as a rule news editors are as able, fearless, and as well informed as Members on this floor.

During the last 60 days the press has made possible the successful fight waged against the "pork barrel." It has forced an administration to back down over the infamous bill. That service may have been influenced in some instances by the startling fact that a direct war tax is about to be passed to cover a "pork barrel," but the Treasury ought ever to be protected against what Senator TILLMAN once termed a "humbug and a steal," and all honor to the American press that helped win the battle.

#### WHAT IS A "PORK BARREL"?

No Member on this floor receives any direct benefit from a pork barrel. Why does an entire Congress determine where a public building or a river and harbor project should be located? One of my first acts performed in a legislative capacity was to introduce two bills for public buildings for cities that furnished the requisite postal receipts. I learned the department did not determine the matter. Congress had to act, and any proposed appropriations, I was informed, would be cut in half. Only two public buildings have been erected in that district in the 74 years of statehood we have enjoyed. One other has been authorized. Possibly these are all that will be allowed for some time, but if my vote to secure a public building for my district involves voting for a corrupt pork barrel I will not stultify myself by supporting for my own people what I denounce in others.



I believe public buildings are of permanent good to local communities, but the interests of Government business should be paramount in determining where such buildings are to be located, and the present system of pork-barrel distribution prevents the consideration by comparative merit. It ought not to depend upon political pull. No man defends the system, and a better businesslike plan should be substituted that will better serve public interests. I refer to public buildings, because two Members of the House assailed my sincerity of purpose by mentioning these bills. I have nothing to conceal nor to defend. If these buildings are worthy projects, they should be built, but with only two public buildings in the district no one will accuse my predecessors of having much influence with any pork barrel in the 74 years the district has been represented in this House.

#### PUBLIC SERVICE, NOT PERSONAL MOTIVES, AT ISSUE.

Independent of my own purposes, the question is not whether I have any interest in rivers and harbors or public buildings. The real question is whether or not a pork barrel exists, and, if so, what should be substituted. I do not assume at this time to say what is the best substitute. Until we become disgusted with pork-barrel methods, until public sentiment forces Congress to change the system, it is idle to propose a change. Possibly I am over sanguine in believing that Congress will some day reject the present system. It is firmly entrenched, but no cause is hopeless if it is right, and every man who has a good, meritorious waterway project should be ready to submit his case to an unprejudiced body for its determination.

#### HOW IS THE PORK BARREL MADE?

Anyone who imagines the river and harbor bill is not a pork barrel for constituencies can be quickly disillusioned by presenting a river and harbor improvement separately to the House or Senate. No one project could be pushed through Congress even though it was subject to introduction as a separate claim or bill. No 10 or 20 river and harbor projects could be engineered through Congress, however meritorious they might be. I do not believe I am misrepresenting the case when I say that no 100 projects, however meritorious individually, could be passed in one bill through Congress.

#### THE BILL'S SUPPORT.

Let us face the facts squarely. The present bill includes some 350 projects. Nearly a hundred additional projects approved by the engineers are on "the waiting list." Hundreds of others are hoping to be advanced in their turn to "the waiting list." Hundreds of other projects are on the maintenance list. Hardly a single Member is not importuned on some project, and this makes up the vote that carries the bill through Congress. Good, bad, and indifferent projects are in the bill. All must be considered. New York Harbor gets in, providing the Scuppernon is remembered. Chicago and other lake ports are included after the lower Mississippi is assured of the lion's share. Boston is placed in the bill when the notorious Trinity gets its place at the pie counter. The river men in the interior insist that improvements at Philadelphia and elsewhere are for the benefit of railways that own or control the terminals, and Philadelphia points to the dwindling Mississippi River commerce, reduced over 80 per cent in 15 years, and declares that the Mississippi River is a land reclamation proposition.

North Carolina, with influential Members at both ends of the Capitol, gets 28 projects, while Florida, equally well represented, runs over a score.

Is it the best we can do? Can any man defend such a scandalous system? How can anyone blame every newspaper in the land for labeling this bill a "pork barrel." To say it is half "pork" or one-half of 1 per cent "pork" does not mean anything definite. If the Philadelphia and Delaware River project, reaching approximately \$21,000,000, is for the benefit of railway terminals, as claimed by Louisiana, then it will generally be regarded as a "pork" proposition for the Government to finance such special-interest projects. The same is true of Bridgeport, Providence, and many other ports mentioned in the report of the Commissioner of Commerce. If the Mississippi River, with its proposed \$9,000,000 in 1914 below St. Louis, is a vast reclamation scheme, as many authorities declare, it, too, is "pork." If the Ohio River \$63,000,000 project is of doubtful value and is undertaken simply to keep contractors and employers busy, it is a questionable investment, particularly when river traffic has fallen off 34 per cent within the last seven years and only a small fraction of river freight goes through the locks.

#### LARGE AND SMALL GRABS.

These are large projects. Some of them may be of value, but others are questionable, and doubts arise from Government reports as to their character. I have not discussed the inter-

coastal canal. North Carolina's officials, from Cabinet members to humble Representatives, are ready to fight for the Beaufort \$5,400,000 canal, although it is of no more use as a naval asset than a fifth wheel to a wagon, in the opinion of other disinterested authorities. The Delaware & Chesapeake Canal, whether it is \$8,000,000 or \$20,000,000, is another link that connects the railway terminals of Philadelphia with the railway terminals of Baltimore, although no railway nor municipality contributes toward this promising bankrupt canal project.

And so it runs, from the Murderkill to the Newbegun, and from Raccoon Creek to the Trinity, and over on the Red and on the Ouachita, that was to receive \$327,500 in the amended substitute bill offered in the Senate. Measured by standards of actual commerce and permanent benefit to navigation, some of these projects are generally conceded to be "pork"—possibly not by those who are urging their passage, for even the water-power interests on the Coosa and Black Warrior are indignant and resent the term, and so do interests along the Tennessee and Cumberland Rivers.

Many of these projects have been analyzed and condemned by the greatest waterway expert in the country, and Senator Burton's judgment will not be rejected by the average unprejudiced mind. It does not answer to insinuate that this distinguished statesman has passed other bad bills in other years, resting his protest with the committee.

#### A HISTORIC FIGHT AGAINST GRAB.

The country knows that Senator BURTON has performed a great public service in exposing the 1914 pork-barrel items and a greater service in defeating an infamous proposition that presumably would not have received a half dozen votes in either House had the projects been voted upon separately.

Every consideration of personal comfort and legislative ease called for tacit consent or silence on his part. The Ohio Senator gave to the country a splendid exhibition of courage, matched by phenomenal physical endurance, that will never be forgotten by those who write the true history of river and harbor legislation.

I have been accused of self-seeking and other offenses, when the big fact remains that the 1914 river and harbor bill, first challenged in the House, was riddled and perforated from beginning to end through the wonderful knowledge of his subject possessed by Senator BURTON.

Many of the wasteful projects exposed in the House were criticized with equal severity by Senators GALLINGER and KENYON, both of whom came to the same conclusions, based upon a careful study of the Engineers' reports. These Senators and those who aided them in giving to the country a true understanding of the infamous bill, are entitled to everlasting credit for the bill's defeat.

#### PERSONALITIES VERSUS ARGUMENT.

For prejudiced, narrow-visioned critics to engage in personalities because of the pork barrel defeat only indicates an absolute lack of fairness possessed by Members who are either ignorant of the provisions of the bill or bitter toward those who oppose their wasteful projects.

In his sweeping statements in the House, the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HULL] honors me with consideration because of my humble efforts to defeat the "pork barrel." The country that has read a telling analysis of extravagant and wasteful Tennessee and Cumberland River projects, as presented by the great waterway expert, Senator BURTON, will not search for a reason. A countercharge that the press of the country enjoys a great graft, which should be investigated, is not creditable to the courage or moral standards of any consenting Member who comes to such conclusions. Much can be said on both sides of that question, but the fact that a speech defending a pork barrel can be sent broadcast throughout the country free, under a Congressman's frank, may also raise an interesting question affecting governmental mail expenditures.

The 1914 pork barrel would not have been defeated but for the splendid fight made by the independent press against it. As an educational medium, it helped keep \$66,000,000 in the Federal Treasury by that defeat. This, in itself, is a highly creditable act, which can not in any degree be placed at the door of the gentleman from Tennessee.

#### WHY NOT HIT THE SENATE COMMITTEE?

Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of replying to the half-hour tirade indulged in by the irascible gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] and his understudy, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON]. The gentleman from Florida was indignant because the Kissimmee River (\$47,000) and the Oklawaha (\$733,000) projects were criticized by me on March 26, when discussing river items in the House. Two facts are significant. First, that it took a Rip Van Winkle sleep of over six months for in-



dignation to sink deep into the mind of the Florida champion before he found time and place for expression. The second and most important factor is that when the Senate committee reported the Senate bill, although it raised the total over \$10,000,000, that committee, with commendable wisdom, struck out the Kissimmee Creek, unnavigable, but not dry, eight months in the year, and the crooked Oklawaha, together with other projects which I exposed in the House. The Senate committee could not swallow such vicious projects, and when no chance for squeezing them through in conference dawned upon the Florida statesman, who honored me with his criticism, then and not until then did the full extent of my offending, six months before, appear.

It is toward the Senate committee, and not myself, that the popguns of the gentleman from Florida should have been aimed.

#### A STUDY IN GLASS HOUSES.

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] seems to be subject to an aggravated case of forgetfulness and Quixotic pork-barrel champaignship.

In other legislative bodies where parliamentary courtesy is observed in debate I have learned that abuse harms only those who indulge in it. Abuse is not argument, and never was the fact more plainly demonstrated than by the unfortunate position into which the gentleman from Mississippi so easily tumbled.

Even the courteous gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY], who was originally opposed to me on the river and harbor bill, felt called upon to express indignation, when he said:

I do not believe it is very becoming of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] to devote four-fifths of his speech to criticizing the Member of the House [Mr. FREAR] who may have been more responsible than any other man for inviting public opinion and fixing public thought on these extravagances.

Mr. Speaker, these are generous words, whether deserved or not, coming as they do from a gentleman who recognizes that vituperation has no proper place in this House.

I will not reply to misrepresentation indulged in by the gentleman from Mississippi concerning "pork" for my district, because I introduced several pension bills for men who gave the best years of their lives trying to keep Mississippi in the Union, men who are now aged invalids. The attack of the Mississippi Member was preceded by a pronounced statement that he would be unworthy of the commission he held if he should refuse to vote for a just pension bill. The Republican leader of the House, who commands the respect and admiration of the entire country, saved me from the necessity of a reply. Somewhere in the remarkable brain of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] there reposes a cell that years before located and tabulated records which determined the truth or untruth of expressions of loyalty to veterans.

After the Mississippi Member finished his carefully prepared verbal assault, the distinguished Republican leader of the House rose and in the course of his remarks said:

I think it is a mistake in the House where some gentleman makes a fight, believing that he is right, that other Members of the House should indulge in personal criticism, if not abuse. [Applause on the Republican side.] I was much surprised that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], for whom I have always entertained a high regard, descended so far in debate, as it seems he did, endeavoring to give a roast to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR], who, I think, is entitled to the thanks of the country for what he has done, whether he be right or wrong. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The applause is not mentioned to give color to the voluntary defense offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], but to show the silence of Democratic Members who a day or so before had passed a \$100,000,000 war-tax bill under a gag rule, but were not pleased to save \$33,000,000 to the country through an emasculated river and harbor bill.

#### THE RECORD SPEAKS FOR ITSELF.

Continuing his remarks, the gentleman from Illinois, while gently fingering several Records before the watchful eyes of the professed lover of war veterans, said:

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], addressing the House with considerable fervor, said:

"You call this a 'pork-barrel' bill. It is no more a 'pork-barrel' bill than the pension bills. I have always voted for pension bills, coming from the South as I do."

Mr. HARRISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. What for?

Mr. HARRISON. I know the gentleman does not want to misrepresent me, but I did not say that I always voted for pension bills. I said I believed in a reasonable pension for those who deserve it.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman said in effect that he always voted for the pension bills. If he does not make any change in his remarks, the Record will justify what I say. It excited my attention and recalled to my memory the fact that the gentleman was slightly in error, in my judgment, and I sent for the Record. We have had several roll calls on pension bills, both on private pension bills and on the general appropriation bills during the last Congress. The gentleman said, in effect: "Look at me. I favor pension bills to be paid to the northern soldiers, but you are now opposing a river and harbor bill to be expended in the South," and he criticized the gentlemen who were opposing the Senate

amendment in this respect. And I find that on March 21, 1912, when the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUSSELL] moved to suspend the rules and pass a private omnibus pension bill, which was passed by a vote of 193 yeas to 34 nays, the name of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], while it did not lead all the rest, is to be found conspicuously among those voting nay; and that on February 18, 1913, when the vote was taken again on the passage of an omnibus private pension bill, and the yeas and nays were ordered at the demand of Mr. Roddenbery, when the yeas were 219 and the nays were 40, again the name of the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], who favors pension legislation and pension bills, is found recorded among those voting "nay." And on March 9, 1912, when we had before us the annual appropriation bill making appropriations to pay those pensions which had already been allowed under the law, on a point of no quorum being made, and the yeas and nays being ordered, the yeas on the passage of the bill being 214 and the nays 38, I find that again the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, so ardently in favor of pension bills and pension appropriation bills, has his name recorded as voting "nay."

I should not have referred to this except for the holier-than-thou attitude which the gentleman from Mississippi assumed while criticizing the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR]. It is a pretty good thing when you live in a glass house not to throw stones.

#### THE GENTLEMAN FROM MISSISSIPPI.

Mr. Speaker, may I digress for a moment to say that one of the best things which has come before the American public this year is "The Gentleman from Mississippi." Good, moral lessons are not taught from the pulpit alone nor by the world's greatest writers. Other messages of human interest, that leave distinct impressions, are often pictured upon the stage.

In the play of that name "The Gentleman from Mississippi" is Senator Langdon, who energetically denounces in the United States Senate a proposed land grab in his own State. His arrival in Washington is featured upon meeting a Union veteran, whose pension he undertakes to secure. While generously placing a roll of bills in the northerner's hands with which to send him home, the gentleman from Mississippi and the northern veteran recall the days when they gallantly fought on opposite sides of the same intrenchments.

Langdon afterwards exposes the "Altacoola" land purchase by the Government of lands in Mississippi and defeats the bill, although it concerned his own State.

"The Gentleman from Mississippi" is a fine type of manliness; a true American, whose sense of honor and justice could not be influenced by personal interests, local considerations, or lobbyists.

"Hamlet" is a wonderful and weird study of human conduct that interests and fascinates the scholar in search of motives, but "The Gentleman from Mississippi," unknown to fame, is a wholesome sermon that appeals to the best impulses of every man.

#### PROJECTS I HAVE CRITICIZED IN THE HOUSE.

May I offer a further reply of a personal character? Upon this floor, with all my energies, I opposed the \$9,000,000 appropriation for the lower Mississippi River land-reclamation scheme, which is part of an unlimited expenditure; also, a \$2,000,000 appropriation for the wasteful Missouri River project, part of an estimated \$20,000,000 wasteful scheme; also, a \$5,000,000 appropriation for the canalization of the Ohio River, part of a \$63,000,000 project; and also a \$2,250,000 appropriation for a bankrupt canal project, part of an eventual \$20,000,000 scheme. The Record will bear out my statement. I have also introduced several resolutions showing the insidious character of the worst lobby ever organized in this country in favor of any bill, a lobby which annually pushes on the pork barrel. The resolutions were promptly smothered or ignored by the committee. The Mississippi Member, in a personal attack, complains because I only presented a score of amendments against the pork barrel, all of which were promptly voted down by a House that refused a roll call; also, because I persisted in offering resolutions of inquiry.

Further amendments were useless where responsibility could not be fixed by roll calls. It was an equal waste of effort in making demands upon the Rivers and Harbors Committee for a report upon my resolutions. Only a simpleton would have wasted time on either proposition. Surely only a simpleton could expect it, and I assume there are no simpletons here.

The reversal of the House's action on the pork-barrel bill is an answer to abuse, and a score of letters of commendation from those engaged in the fight show the resolutions served a purpose, if not all that was desired. I appealed from the House action to a higher forum in the case of the pork barrel, and I appeal to a higher forum than any committee when I insert in these remarks a portion of the evidence I have to sustain allegations contained in the resolutions.

#### HUMBLE EFFORTS ARE APPRECIATED.

Mr. Speaker, by our acts we shall be known. I do not expect to measure up to my own ideals while a Member of this House. I expect to make mistakes, and shall ever be glad to receive fair criticism, but insincere accusations are of no value.

I can not find words of appreciation for the remark of the distinguished gentleman from Illinois that I am in any degree entitled to the thanks of the country for my work against the \$53,000,000 pork barrel. The generous expression of the gentleman from Massachusetts that I, more than any other one man, may have been responsible in uniting public opinion and fixing public thought on river and harbor extravagances, is also appreciated. May I be pardoned for here inserting other kindly words, which come unsolicited from a distinguished Senator who perfected an organization and rendered eloquent service to the country with Senator BURTON when the \$53,000,000 vicious pork barrel was defeated.

UNITED STATES SENATE,  
September 23, 1914.

HON. JAMES A. FREAR,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. FREAR: Now that the river and harbor bill is defeated, I can not refrain from giving credit where credit is due. You are the man who started the whole fight; you are the man who is entitled to the credit. You, in my judgment, performed one of the greatest public services that any man has ever done in Congress. I congratulate you from the bottom of my heart.

If you need me in your campaign, I will be glad to come there and tell the people what a splendid Representative you have been. Would that we had more men in Congress like you.

Sincerely, yours,

W. S. KENTON.

A brief word received from the distinguished man who made the great victory possible is also inserted:

HOT SPRINGS, VA., October 1, 1914.

HON. JAMES A. FREAR,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. FREAR: I learn that the House concurred night before last in the Senate substitute after a lively debate.

I am here for a brief rest, but can not omit to congratulate you on your part in this most happy outcome. I am sure that you will be listened to more attentively next winter than you were last winter or spring.

Yours, sincerely,

T. E. BURTON.

Words of commendation quoted from Members of the House and Senate, with many others from leading journals of the country, I place in the scales against the record of the gentleman from Mississippi, which was read to the House by the gentleman from Illinois.

To show that legitimate transportation companies are not misled as to the real issue, a brief extract is offered from a lengthy resolution passed at its annual meeting in 1914 by the leading commercial body of the country, the New York Board of Trade and Transportation:

Whereas through the efforts mainly of Congressman JAMES A. FREAR, of Wisconsin, and Senator THEODORE E. BURTON, of Ohio, the 1914 rivers and harbors bill as reported by the Senate Commerce Committee has been defeated—

\* \* \* \* \*  
Resolved, That while we regret the defeat of certain items in the rivers and harbors bill \* \* \* we nevertheless regard with approval the defeat of the bill as a whole, and commend Congressman JAMES A. FREAR, of Wisconsin, and Senator THEODORE E. BURTON, of Ohio, for their courage and perseverance in opposing the inflated rivers and harbors bill and cordially congratulate them upon the success of their efforts.

It is needless to say I had no intention of dragging my own personality into this controversy, but from many kind words received throughout the country I am content to leave my record to the judgment of those who are disinterested and unprejudiced.

#### THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER PROJECT.

Mr. Speaker, I have made an investigation in a small way of the Mississippi River land-reclamation scheme. Under the 1914 river and harbor bill which passed the House the Mississippi River below St. Louis received the enormous amount of \$8,000,000, whereas the river above St. Louis, of about equal length and carrying equal tonnage, received only \$1,500,000. When the bill was reported to the Senate it carried \$9,000,000 below St. Louis and \$1,500,000 above that city to St. Paul. In other words, for every dollar spent on the northern half of the river six dollars were given to the southern half. And it must not be forgotten that traffic upon the lower Mississippi has decreased over 80 per cent within the last 20 years, according to Government reports.

This is the bill carrying \$9,000,000 for the lower Mississippi River that I am charged—I trust correctly—with having helped to defeat.

Just how much of the \$20,000,000 will be spent by Army engineers on the Mississippi remains to be seen.

#### THE PORK BARREL IS NOW A KEG.

The substitute amendment carries \$20,000,000, or less than two-fifths of the \$53,000,000 contained in the original pork barrel. If other projects receive an equal proportion of the new "pork keg," then the Mississippi, instead of receiving \$9,000,000 below St. Louis, will be given approximately two-fifths of \$9,000,000, or about \$3,600,000. This will be a saving to the country of \$5,400,000 that ought not to be squeezed out of our people in unjust and unnecessary war taxes. For this result I

am held, in part, responsible by the gentleman from Mississippi, and it is not unreasonable to presume that his indignation in part is predicated upon that loss to the lower Mississippi and proportionate saving to the Government. Is it a "pork" proposition to throw millions of dollars annually into the Mississippi River? I recognize the cry for flood protection that has been raised by people of the lower Mississippi River Valley, and I believe I am as much in sympathy with that cry as other Members on this floor. But I am firmly convinced that nearly all of the money now poured into the lower Mississippi is being wasted; that we have been hypnotized by the voice of the experimenting Army engineer, on the one hand, and have been influenced by a hope that we are helping to prevent floods, on the other.

I firmly believe the present Mississippi River reclamation system is a monstrous waste of money, and that the country will awake to the true state of facts within a short space of time. I further believe that much of the agitation behind the present Mississippi levee improvements is caused by reclamation interests which desire to reclaim private lands at Government expense. Thus far in the discussion of the waterways of the country I have tried to furnish credible testimony on every point to sustain my belief. If I fail to do so in this case, I know it will invite ridicule, but I am not concerned, because ridicule encountered when we began the fight against the river and harbor bill determined nothing. Results count.

Let me say, in passing, it would be ungenerous to accept credit or all blame for that fight when we remember the excellent aid given to the same movement by the able gentleman from Texas [Mr. CALLAWAY]. He was called away to defend his record before his constituents, a splendid record, far better in service to his State and country than the record of those who tried to save the Trinity River project. After his departure I tried to keep alive interest in the matter. I claim no credit for performing a public duty.

#### THE MISSISSIPPI HAS SWALLOWED A VAST SUM.

Mr. Speaker, the Mississippi River has received between \$150,000,000 and \$200,000,000 from Government and local contributions, most of which has gone into the river south of St. Louis. Army engineers have indorsed all manner of worthless schemes. Politics, personal interest, and a variety of causes are assigned for incompetence. In the case of the Mississippi River wholesale criticism arises, in my judgment, from a combination of unfortunate influences. If political pressure will affect the distribution of the \$20,000,000 pork barrel, as has been stated on the floor of the House by champions of the Army engineers' system, then what must be expected where the owners of lands and other interests to be affected bring pressure for the same purpose against the same officers?

At this point I desire to introduce a resolution into the Record concerning the Mississippi River, which is now awaiting action from the Rivers and Harbors Committee:

[H. Con. Res. 50. Sixty-third Congress, second session. In the House of Representatives, September 21, 1914. Mr. FREAR submitted the following concurrent resolution, which was referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.]

Whereas about \$200,000,000 have been expended in attempt to control the Mississippi River below Cairo, principally by the use of levees and revetments, which as a means for that purpose are deemed by many to be impracticable and futile; and

Whereas by the present rivers and harbors bill further great sums of money are proposed to be appropriated to continue this questionable attempt by the same means: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That no appropriation made by the present rivers and harbors bill shall be available for use upon the Mississippi River below Cairo until the feasibility and advisability of plans which depend upon levees and revetments for control of the Mississippi River below Cairo have been approved, or other plans substituted by an advisory board of consulting engineers, in accordance with the provisions of H. R. 18169, now before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Resolved further, That the members of such advisory board of consulting engineers, appointed by the President in conformity with the provisions of said bill, shall require to be confirmed by the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, it is impossible in a few remarks to present more than an outline of the weakness and wastefulness of the present Mississippi River system. The flood of the early eighties, followed by the flood of 1903 and the recent floods of 1912 and 1913, do not faze the Mississippi River Commission nor the Army engineers who are superintending the project. Washed-out levees and flooded districts are viewed with equanimity as long as the Treasury holds out. Political conventions of all parties are persuaded to adopt resolutions with promises of aid, and Presidents are importuned to exercise their influence in retaining present officials and keeping up the present wasteful system.

#### A BILLION-DOLLAR LAND PROJECT.

Nor is the reclamation of lands overlooked when it is estimated that 20,000,000 acres in the Deltas can be protected by a



system of levees. Of this amount 80 per cent is estimated to be now valueless, but when the land is reclaimed the increase in value will be phenomenal.

Prior to the floods of 1880, before these levees had been tested and their inadequacy ascertained, the opinions of Presidents and of Congresses were clearly set forth in frequent utterances, one of much significance being a provision in the 1881 rivers and harbors bill, which expressly provided that no portion of the sum thereby appropriated should be used in the repair or construction of levees for the purpose of preventing injury to lands by overflow or for any other purpose whatever, except as a means of deepening or improving the channel of said river.

It is significant that the river and harbor bill of 1881, which covered every river and harbor in the country from Maine to California, reached a total expenditure of \$8,951,500, whereas the amounts carried by the river and harbor bill for this year on the Mississippi alone reached \$10,500,000, and of this amount \$9,000,000 was for the lower Mississippi, south of St. Louis. More money was carried for the lower Mississippi River in the 1914 bill than for all the rivers and harbors of the country in 1881, and yet remember, according to Government reports, the traffic on the lower Mississippi has decreased over 80 per cent since 1881.

The total amount carried by the sundry civil bill and river and harbor bill for 1914 was about seven and one-half times the amount carried in 1881. River traffic decreased on southern waterways as a whole during that period, although according to the statement of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Treadway], as shown by page 17361 of the Record, considerably over one-half was for the South.

#### THE STARTLING APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1914.

A \$10,500,000 appropriation for the Mississippi River is amazing because of the following facts:

First. When refusal to appropriate Federal funds to aid private reclamation was put into effect, vast waterway influences, so called, were organized to secure funds from the Government for the Mississippi River land-reclamation scheme.

Second. The 1914 bill carried more money for reclamation of the Mississippi River lands than the entire appropriation for all Government waterways in 1881.

Third. Navigation has decreased 80 per cent on the lower river and is now comparatively small, although the policy of 1881, protesting against the use of money except for navigation, is being completely brushed aside.

I am not expecting to see a change in policy at this time, because "flood protection" and not land reclamation is kept before the people as the issue. Neither do I expect to see a change at this time in the policy of giving \$80,000,000, or ten times that amount, of Government money in order to reclaim 20,000,000 acres of land along the lower Mississippi for private parties, land that is not to pay anything for benefits received.

The propaganda carried on by the Mississippi River Levee Association and by the Rivers and Harbors Congress has bewildered Congress and the people into acquiescing in this great land-reclamation scheme at Government expense.

I am confident the appalling raids on the Federal Treasury in the name of "flood protection" are growing in force and frequency, so that the country will soon ask Congress to investigate what this reclamation scheme comprehends.

#### WASTED MONEY THE REAL ISSUE.

However, these are suggestions that are not involved in the proposition I desire briefly to discuss, and that is the incompetency and waste which characterizes the present levee scheme. I have asked in a resolution for a competent advisory board; a board of distinguished high-class engineers, who will squarely confront the problem and solve it, if it is to be solved. The judgment of Goethals and men of his size would give confidence that the money spent is not entirely wasted, as is now contended. A million dollars spent in ascertaining the truth would be economy, although no one believes it would cost one-tenth of that amount. The present commission is pursuing its own course, and it will do so until the American people are brought face to face with the fact that the Mississippi River reclamation policy has been a drifting policy and a wasteful piece of growing extravagance.

When the river and harbor bill was before the House I believed the subject was of such importance that I discussed the bill at some length. The enormous sums of Government money to be spent on this project, in addition to the great economic loss involved, leads me now to offer opinions of others as to the present levee plan.

#### AUTHORITIES, NOT PERSONAL OPINIONS, OFFERED.

I have no opinion to express as to what plan should be urged. That is a matter for experts to determine. I do believe that

common sense and a knowledge of elementary physics will serve to discredit the present plan. One of the witnesses whose word is of more than ordinary value is Gen. Herman Haupt, known throughout the country as an eminent military and civil engineer, a man who died several years ago. Gen. Haupt left a pamphlet of great value to the country at this particular time. Gen. Haupt was an engineer, author, and inventor of wide experience and high character. The positions he occupied as engineer of railroads and other great corporations, including at one time the city of Philadelphia, entitle his words to more than ordinary weight.

In a remarkable pamphlet issued a few years ago, entitled "The Problem of the Mississippi," he presents a strong, comprehensive arraignment of the present system. On page 8 he says:

Charles Ellet, who represented the United States Government in connection with river investigation in 1851, was sufficiently bold to assert that to sustain a flood of the velocity of that of 1851 the levees must be made at least 2 feet higher from Red River to New Orleans, for which assertion he was in 1861 severely criticized by the representatives of Government in charge of river matters. Instead of 2 feet levees are now [at the time he was speaking] 5 feet higher than in 1857. The estimate of the Government engineers in 1861 for complete protection from Cairo to the Gulf, including value of existing levees, was \$26,000,000. There have been expended since 1861 in levees still incomplete more than \$5,000,000, and the cost of the levee system when completed will not be less than \$100,000,000.

Since that day the total has doubled in amount. One might imagine this was a chapter from engineers' estimates on the Coosa or the Red or the Black Warrior or the Trinity or a hundred other streams on which Government engineers have increased their estimates. Gen. Haupt, in presenting his case against the present levee system, calls upon the opinion of Mr. L. W. Brown, civil engineer, wherein Mr. Brown asks:

Has the Mississippi River Commission such knowledge and has it made such investigation as one necessary to determine that the bed of the river is not being lengthened? If they have, why is not this most valuable information made public? If the flood elevations are increased, as past experience teaches us they have been, and if they have occasioned a decrease in the slope of the whole river, as is shown to be the case, although not published by the commission, by what hydraulic laws would the deduction be made that the bed is not fouling? If no phenomenon has occurred which was not anticipated by them, the commission is responsible for the losses this country sustained in 1897, amounting to upward of \$100,000,000.

Two further brief extracts are quoted. On page 20 Gen. Haupt says:

It has been shown that before the river was interfered with by the construction of continuous levees the changes in flood elevations were very slow, only 1 foot in 90 years, while the construction of levees has caused a rise as great as 1 foot in 2½ years.

A further extract from page 23 is directly to the point when he says:

No single plan of improvement can solve the problem of the Mississippi—neither levees, outlets, waste ways, or diversions will singly be sufficient, but a combination of all, directed by intelligence. Levees are required for local protection, but a system of continuous levees for highest floods from Cairo to the Gulf is the worst that could have been conceived.

#### CONTINUOUS LEVEES ARE VALUELESS.

Surely the last statement is significant when we are appropriating for the levee system more per year than we did for the whole country a little over a score of years ago.

Prof. Lewis M. Haupt, a son of Gen. Haupt, a civil engineer of high standing, has made a study of conditions on the Mississippi River, and has presented several instructive papers on the subject, which it is impossible to more than refer to briefly.

In an address before the Franklin Institute on "Controlling the floods of the Mississippi River" he says, after discussing the great loss of property through floods:

In behalf of the engineering profession it seems necessary to state the responsibility for these disasters does not rest with it, since Congress has the sole jurisdiction and control of these questions and its attention has frequently been called by engineers and river men to remedial measures which have not been adopted. The real causes may better be ascribed to politics and local interests, as may be illustrated by the following reported interview with one of the most sagacious railroad magnates of the country (Jay Gould), now deceased, who, on being requested to lend his aid to the passage of an act which would have provided earlier relief to the Mississippi Valley, is said to have replied: "I have read all the arguments before Congress. The outlet system is correct and the only way to deepen the Mississippi River. If that were done, what would become of not only my own but all other railroads coming to New York?" They would be ruined, and for that reason he would favor the levee system, for so long as that be kept up there need be no fears of the Mississippi as a competitor.

If Jay Gould were alive to-day his road and every other railway in the Mississippi Valley would join the railways that are now contributing to the support of the Mississippi River Levee Association.

Several years ago Prof. Haupt presented a strong comprehensive report on the Mississippi River problem, which reached the same conclusions as those formed by Gen. Haupt, Charles Ellet, and Mr. Brown.

Believing that a personal letter, one of a large number received from Prof. Haupt during the past six months, may throw additional light on the Mississippi levee system, I quote brief passages:

CYNWID, PA., September 28, 1914.

HON. JAMES A. FREAR.

MY DEAR SIR: Your favor of the 26th is at hand, and I hasten to comply, feeling that the almost lifelong study I have given the question may not have been in vain when carefully considered by unbiased interests. You have sized up the situation as to levees, and the demand made upon the Government to aid in them under the guise of improving navigation, but, as Senator Berry said, it was a blind, since Congress had no authority to go into reclamation of lands.

One of the best men, thoroughly familiar with the river, is Lyman E. Cooley, civil engineer, of Chicago, also James Sedden, of St. Louis, both of whom were in the service of the United States in early years. Others, now deceased, like Prof. Johnson, Brown, Starling, etc., have left their record. Ockerson and Taylor, who are still on the commission, are very capable and well-informed men, but in the minority.

Sedden's papers and hydrographs indicated a rational system for protection from floods and providing an adequate navigation by lateral reservoirs in the waste lands, but this is only a partial remedy, and it has been vigorously opposed by levee advocates by stating they would be wholly inadequate.

I can not go into details, but for all the remedial elements will refer you to the letter I sent Judge BURTON extracted from the Transportation Crisis (a copy of which I think I sent you some time ago), vide page 20 in the Great Basin, and page 27, the Great Belt Route—Levees and Navigation.

The letter referred to making inquiries was from Senator Brice, of Ohio, 1887. This was 27 years ago, since when probably over \$100,000,000 have been expended and the 9-foot stage has not been secured on either the Ohio or the Mississippi. See the confession made by the commission of 1900 (p. 29): "It is continually making experiments looking to the best use of available material when Congress shall provide for such a systematic improvement."

#### ENGINEERS, NOT CONGRESS, ARE RESPONSIBLE.

This it seems is not the duty of Congress, as it is an engineering question and has not been satisfactorily solved, since the policy is vacillating and the attempt seems to be made to correct the river locally by patchwork instead of as a whole by applying physical laws to the entire basin.

See V. P. 41 (2) giving a summary of the fifth of this series of papers. I send a blue leaflet, No. 2, giving extracts from Maj. Guin, United States engineer, and the various estimates. Since then many of the natural outlets have been closed in efforts to force all the water through the Passes to scour out the bars, but overlooking the fact that the mud remains to be ejected at the outlets, thus increasing the rate of advance of the bars and the amount of dredging.

While the United States engineers are absolutely independent of politics they are also not amenable to the electorate (the people), hence are virtually unaccountable to anyone for their mistakes, and the officials change their posts so often that they can not even assume the honor or responsibility for results. I say this without criticism, for it is the radical fault of the system.

Continuing, as to interference with the power of the engineers, who control the river and harbor projects of the country, Prof. Haupt says:

They are entrenched behind the Treasury, but as the Missouri Commission was abolished for insufficient results it may be possible to follow the precedent and satisfy the public that their levees and property will be better secured by the use of all remedies available instead of the single one—the levee system—which must ultimately bring disaster and destruction, because there is no escape for the silt.

#### THE REAL PROJECT.

In conclusion Prof. Haupt makes this cogent statement:

As you have asked for my candid opinion, I have not hesitated to give it, so that perchance it may lead to a change of policy for the public weal. The public at large is not interested, so long as they do not own plantations behind the levees; and those who do, demand the protection of private property, which is given without legal sanction and paid for by the Nation. The money is virtually wasted in redoubts and intrenchments—against an invisible foe—which can not escape, but builds its own counterscarps, scales the barriers, and destroys the innocent citizens living under their shelter.

Very respectfully, yours,

LEWIS M. HAUPT.

On the day following the introduction of the Mississippi River resolution, I received personal words of commendation from high authority here in Washington, stating that my premises were right, the present system wasteful and disastrous, and the only protection to the country would be by the appointment of a high-class temporary advisory board, as I proposed, to make an investigation and report without delay. I was assured that such a board would unhesitatingly condemn the present extravagant and wasteful scheme, which is unsound in character but continues to receive the approval of an ossified policy, as fixed and immovable as the prejudices which governed the persecutors of Columbus.

I do not offer this statement by way of argument, but to show the difficulty surrounding efforts to obtain the truth, when officials and competent authorities feel obliged to write "personal" at the top of their communications for obvious reasons—and I have received many such messages during the six months' consideration of the river and harbor pork barrel.

#### ANOTHER ENGINEER'S STATEMENT.

A strong, fearless man who has a long list of accomplishments to his credit, and who has frequently pointed out to me the disastrous Mississippi River policy now being undertaken by the Government, is Mr. Carroll L. Riker, of Brooklyn, an engi-

neer of large experience in waterway work. Mr. Riker believes he has solved the Mississippi River problem, and has presented a bill to that effect, now before Congress. While it appears to be reasonable and logical to the layman, I have no opinion to express as to its merits, nor does Mr. Riker ask for its support until he has convinced Congress that the present system is wrong and, to use his words, "criminally wasteful."

With unbounded courage he guarantees to compel admissions of incompetency of the present plan from the Army Engineers themselves if he can secure a hearing—and no man can listen to his plain, common-sense exposition of the Mississippi River problem without being impressed by his sincerity and ability. Mr. Riker has accomplished some important things in the way of public engineering service that can not be disputed, and I believe he would be able to convince any unprejudiced man or body, if given a hearing, that the present Mississippi River improvement scheme is as bad as he declares it to be.

Mr. Riker is a mild-mannered man, who, however, does not mince words when he says, in a statement made to me:

The plans of the United States Army Engineers for the control of the Mississippi River are the greatest engineering blunders which have ever been perpetrated upon a nation. These plans show that they do not understand the underlying and first principle which naturally governs the flow of a river.

If an advisory board of consulting engineers be appointed who are not graduates of West Point to investigate these plans, and they used as data only that which is printed and officially indorsed by these Army engineers, they would certainly confirm the above statement after less than 24 hours of actual consideration.

Mr. Riker then engages in a technical, but clearly presented, discussion of river currents and other related influences which I will not quote; but he further adds some information in unmistakable English which the lay mind can easily digest. He says:

These United States Army engineers for more than 50 years have uniformly shown ignorance of the existence of the greatest law in the universe, that of centrifugal force, or the law of straight tendency, which is constantly exerting its influence to straighten the course of all rivers and, where obstructions to such a course are removed, maintains rivers in a course as straight as an arrow. \* \* \* This straight tendency, which is due to the influence of centrifugal force, causes all matter in motion to move in a straight line and unlike that of any other force increases with the square of velocity of the matter in motion. \* \* \* This force influencing the waters of the Mississippi River to maintain a straight line increases sixty-four fold as the velocity of its waters increase from one-half mile per hour to 4 miles per hour.

#### EMBALMED FALLACIES OF ENGINEERS.

Referring to authorities that have been the fetish of Mississippi River work, he says:

The embalmed fallacies of Humphries and Abbott have been blindly followed for more than 50 years by these engineers, who have built dikes, revetments, and levees at the cost of more than a hundred million dollars in their efforts to make this river pursue a crooked and unnatural course, wholly in opposition to all of nature's natural inclinations.

There are engineers of the Army who would not commit themselves to these blunders. The president of the Mississippi River Commission represents those who do and expresses their views on this question in the following paragraph contained in his report bearing date of May 16, 1913, to the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, in reply to the request of the President for information on this subject:

"Cut-offs: By cutting off the bends in a river, its length is diminished and slope increased. This would increase its discharge at a given height. This method of relief can not be applied to the Mississippi River, as it would seriously injure its navigability during low water, and increase the caving of its banks, which is now excessive. While it would afford relief in the upper portions of the river thus straightened, it would increase flood heights at the lower end, benefiting one locality at the expense of another." (See Appendix A, p. 11.)

When the engineering profession have had their attention specifically drawn to the facts connected with the present plans of the Army engineers for control of this river it will entail a national engineering disgrace that is unavoidable. Thirty-four annual reports of the Mississippi River Commission, concurred in by the various Chiefs of Engineers, United States Army, then acting, are mute witnesses against them that can never be effaced. There is not one word that can be uttered in extenuation of these blunders which have been perpetrated by these engineers upon the citizens of the United States for a lifetime. They are now preparing a trap for the unconscious, confiding settlers in the valley of that river which will terminate in a terrible catastrophe as certain as the sun is to rise unless the present program be radically modified.

Mr. Speaker, it may be said by those who are criticized that personal interest influences the judgment of men who are not Army engineers. It is an argument used at both ends of the Capitol by statesmen of greater or less caliber, who impugn motives of personal interest to every act, and who ascribe disappointment or other unworthy influences to all criticisms of the pork barrel. Such replies will have no weight with those in search of the truth, and I am sure the common-sense proposition offered by the eminent men I have quoted can not be scoffed out of court much longer.

#### THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION'S DEMAND OF \$12,000,000 FOR 1915.

If any corroboration is needed of lack of knowledge and understanding of the Mississippi River problem, then an examination of the testimony of Judge R. S. Taylor, of the Mississippi River Commission, taken by the Committee on Commerce of the United States Senate, will convince doubters. Other amazing



confessions of uncertainty and doubt appear in the hearings conducted before the Senate committee, and yet, with an audacity possessed only by a Col. Fox, with whom we may later become acquainted, the Mississippi River Commission demands \$12,000,000 for that river in 1915. Even this extravagant amount does not satisfy all land reclamationists along the lower stretch of the river, persons who see visions of wealth whenever the present worthless lands along the river are reclaimed by the taxpayers of the country through the agency of a Federal Treasury.

Read House Report No. 390 of this Sixty-third Congress. It relates to claims for damages against the Government because of improper levee plans on the Mississippi River. Nothing further is required to place a seal of condemnation on the Government's handling of the Mississippi problem. I quoted from this report in my remarks contained in the RECORD for June 19. It is an astounding fact that we continue to annually pour millions into the river without any comprehensive plan or permanent results in mind. What is the reason? Who is responsible for this enormous waste of Government funds? Everybody places the burden on the shoulders of some other body. Why not get at the facts by passing my resolution?

#### WHAT DO THE RIVER PEOPLE SAY?

Those who are familiar with local conditions declare misfortune has been shrewdly capitalized and the Government Treasury is the goal of those who, in the aggregate, have many hundreds of millions of dollars at stake through a reclaimed land scheme. I am not able at this time to discuss the selfish purposes behind the Mississippi River improvement scheme, but I am endeavoring to show that though the Government pours its millions into the river for the benefit of reclamationists the supposed beneficiaries will not receive any anticipated benefit, because the improvements will not be permanent.

The present plan does not deceive many people along the river valley, as I propose to show. Without means of securing all the information I would gladly present, I offer such proof as has accidentally fallen into my hands.

On September 28, 1914, the New Orleans Item printed an editorial which relates to several matters involved in this discussion, all of which may not be strictly pertinent to this particular point, but it clearly shows a leading publication of the great Queen City is not in sympathy with the Mississippi River Levee Association, the present system of river levee improvements, or the 1914 pork barrel. For all of these reasons the Item is entitled, in my humble judgment, to the thanks of the Mississippi Valley, which looks for permanent improvement of the river, not extravagance, waste, and a blindness to impending danger. I place the editorial in the RECORD because it is relevant to the subject:

[From the New Orleans Item, September 28, 1914.]

#### THE PORK BARREL, US, AND OUR NEIGHBOR.

"From the news column of The Item we learn that Congressman FREAR, of Wisconsin, proposes to introduce a resolution directing the Attorney General to investigate alleged lobbying activities of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress and the Mississippi River Levee Association.

"The grounds are that they have brought improper influences to bear in favor of the rivers and harbors bill; that they are using agents and newspapers to stir up sentiment; that they have collected money for their propaganda from various commercial and railway bodies; that they have assumed to dictate to Members of Congress how to vote; and that they are carrying on an insidious lobby.

"These grounds are so nearly identical with those on which The Item and Mr. George H. Maxwell, champion of the Newlands bill, and Mr. J. J. Hill's ready typewriter, have based their own fight against the Ransdell-Humphreys bill that we have an idea that these are the sources from which Mr. FREAR has gathered his alleged information."—New Orleans States.

This statement of the case and the "idea" of our sad contemporary are alike utterly untrue and needlessly incorrect. When we recall the blunders into which The States bogged in its efforts to misrepresent the attitude of President Wilson and the governor of Ohio on the problem of river control, however, we have no reason to anticipate that anything but profound ignorance and destructive prejudice will shape the utterances of our esteemed contemporary on this subject.

The National Rivers and Harbors Congress conducts a national lobby for the pork-barrel bill.

The Mississippi River Levee Association was organized by some railroad interests who do not want genuine and permanent stream control, because it threatens competition by levee-board politicians and levee contractors whose jobs and profits depend upon the perpetuation of the stupid and vicious old system of disjointed levee maintenance under which the people of the valley have been bled and pillaged, both ignorantly and willfully, for the past generation, and left hopelessly exposed to terrible floods at the end of the process. The genii that framed this latter organization also framed a bill, and Mr. RANDELL and Congressman HUMPHREYS of Mississippi let their names be tacked to it.

The two institutions are ostensibly separate.

The statement that the Item or Mr. Maxwell attacked the Rivers and Harbors Congress is untrue. Our general attitude toward it has been a feeling that if the Federal Treasury is to be looted for the selfish purposes of Congressmen and local interests that have strings on Congressmen, our own part of the country had as well have its share of the loot. The managers of the Newlands campaign have gone further than that, however, and figured on using whatever could

be derived from this bill as an adjunct to Mississippi appropriations under the Newlands bill.

What the item has done in this matter is to tell its readers the simple truth about the standing of this pork-barrel measure before the people of the country. We have not been ignorant or dishonest about it. We told you a year ago that the feeling of the Nation against the abuses of the pork barrel was approaching a climax so rapidly that it was utterly unsafe to trust to the barrel for any adequate relief from floods. We warned you that the country would not allow many more pork barrels to be opened. We advised some other method, and led the fight for the Newlands bill as the best one.

The Item has been the only newspaper in New Orleans to take this course. The result vindicates its stand. We have been bitterly berated for this course by the other three newspapers. Ignorance or untruth alone can account for their behavior. We urge you to be charitable in determining for yourself to which their course is chargeable.

The Item's readers know from its past exposures that the Mississippi Valley Levee Association is built on a foundation of railroad cash. It is a pleasure to note that the Item's photographic proof of this fact was exhibited to the Senate during the recent debate. Everybody ought to know the truth.

Our contemporary's statement of Mr. FREAR's attitude on the pork-barrel lobby, with which the Item had nothing whatever to do, is quite incorrect. He did not object to the fact that the managers of the "congress" have "collected money for their propaganda." He charged that they used solicitors for this purpose and paid these solicitors one-half of the money thus collected from innocents who thought they were giving up their cash for legitimate constructive waterway promotion, and could not have known that half of it stayed with the seductive gentlemen who took it away from them.

How would you like to hand a persuasive gentleman \$10 "for rivers and harbors" promotion, knowing that he was going to keep \$5 for his own drinks, cigars, and board bill?

The States' idea that we furnished the information for this charge to Mr. FREAR does us too much honor. The source of it appears on page 16785 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the current term, in the following language:

"Mr. KENYON. Now, where does the money come from to carry on this great propaganda throughout this country? Why should it be necessary for large sums of money to be spent in giving dredgers' association banquets to influential citizens, as I have here read from their statements?"

"I want to get into the record, which I am trying to preserve for the people of this country, who are going to pass on this question eventually, a letter, which I am authorized to use, to Mr. FREAR, of Wisconsin, who fought this bill in the House almost alone. \* \* \* This letter is from Mr. Richard M. McCann, the publisher of Waterways and Commerce, a monthly magazine. \* \* \* In it he says:

"I inclose herewith original subscription lists obtained from a canvasser named Mr. John M. Williams, of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, who received 50 per cent for obtaining the amounts set opposite each name. As you will see, the subscriptions cover 1909, 1910, 1911, and 1912."

The States could not have expressed such a blundering "idea" as that we have just exploded except in utter ignorance of a public record open to everybody.

The self-intoxication of politician journalism was never better exemplified than in our contemporary's further language:

"We trust that the Item's cup of satisfaction is full now that the Republican filibusters have succeeded in striking \$4,500,000 from the appropriation provided for the Mississippi, and thus very largely increase the peril which must confront the people of Louisiana and Mississippi when the next great flood comes rolling down. It is to be entitled to share whatever credit may be due for the blow at our security, and it may be added that no Senator who voted against the bill can be blamed for doing so when he can point to a New Orleans newspaper for vindication of his course."

Is our befuddled neighbor not a little premature in its mathematics? Hasn't \$20,000,000 been left to the Army engineers for use in their discretion? They say they do not know yet how they will apportion it. Is the colonel their boss, too? Is he going to limit his suffering people to such a trifle as three and a half millions?

And suppose we had got "our" eight millions, which was merely a figment of Mr. RANDELL's fruitless imagination—he was imagining \$60,000,000 at the same time—what "peril" would it have "averted"? Would it not have been merely a continuation of the "delightful stream of scattered dribbles," as the classic JOHN SHARP WILLIAMS once phrased it, that are just enough to glide into the river by the time the next high water comes up? Has it not been a generation of pork-barrel dribbles and political newspaperdom that destroyed Dayton and submerged a score of Louisiana parishes at the end?

We do not accept our good neighbor's well-meant statement of the case, but lest there be any doubt about it, we hasten to assure everybody that we are quite proud of our contribution to the enlightenment of a suffering people, oppressed by log-rolling politicians and benighted by an ignorant and incompetent press, upon the fundamental causes that keep the pall of flood above them.

From Memphis, a city that has suffered through the ill-advised experiments of Army engineers, comes a note of warning in two editorials forwarded to me by a gentleman who appears to understand the Mississippi River problem better than those who are now disbursing Government funds for an impractical levee scheme.

The News Scimitar, of Memphis, on November 26, 1913, gave a clean-cut expression of the views of the people it represents in the second great city of the Mississippi River Valley. It is as follows:

[From the Memphis News Scimitar, November 26, 1913.]

#### ON TO WASHINGTON.

After a Peter the Hermit campaign, carried on by Evangelist John A. Fox, at the expense of the railroads, for several months, in which a purely unreckoning and mechanical sentiment has been worked up in favor of the futile "levees-only" idea, a descent is to be made on Washington in the near future, through which, by a show of numbers, Congress is to be coerced into siphoning out of the Treasury \$60,000,000 for a continuation of the mud-pie system of confining the waters of the Mississippi River at flood tide. Anticipation is cloud piercing, and the bird of hope is soaring high without moulting a feather in the ranks of



the political levee boards up and down the river, while the absentee Mississippi River Commission fancies it sees before it a new lease of life. In spite of all this, there will be snags encountered in the stream.

It is not unknown in Congress and throughout the country that those cooling turtle doves, the political levee boards, are thoroughly discredited by the property owners, and that they maintain a show of vitality by shaking hands with each other. The "indorsements" so much touted mean nothing more than the price which various organizations that care nothing and know nothing about the question are willing to pay to be let alone. They have all been appealed to, barring the Ladies' Auxiliary of the Hod Carriers' Union, with the same result, which meant, "Take it and get away."

For 200 years the levee system has been tried and found wanting, and the more money that is spent on levees the more disastrous do they become.

Valuable lands on the outside of the levees have been rendered worthless by the increased elevation of the flood heights, and no consideration is given these people or their 9,000 square miles of territory in the way of reimbursement. Memphis has suffered sorely as a result of levees, and is now asked to join in the clamor for more levees.

Congress is asked for \$60,000,000, while it is admitted that no proper surveys have been made, and under the present pork-barrel system there is no assurance that competent engineers will have the work in charge.

Figures will not yield to clamor. In 1882, with 52 feet of water on the gauge at Cairo, the stage at Memphis was 35 feet, there being no levees on the Arkansas side. Every part of the city was above water. In 1913 Cairo had a stage of 56 feet, while Memphis was submerged and much property destroyed by a stage of 46.5 feet, or an increase of 11.5 feet over the stage of 1882. We are issuing bonds for local protection while being called upon at the same time to ask for more money and more levees, which are making local expenditure for self-preservation necessary.

The old brutal logic that we must "get some of that Yankee money down here" is no longer appealing. The Mississippi River Commission has been discredited by its own reluctant admissions. The political levee boards have been discredited by the people and the logic of events. We must have a new deal and a square deal. We must adopt new and better methods. We must put new and better men in charge, and we must make provision to reimburse those whose property the levee system has destroyed.

Listen to the following denunciation from the Memphis Press of September 12, 1914:

THE "PORK BARREL" IS AN ENEMY OF NAVIGATION.

We have told our readers on many occasions that the conscience of the Nation was revolting against the "pork barrel."

We told them that we were crucifying our own chances for permanent relief from floods and from permanent re-establishment of navigation when we continued longer to put our faith in the hodge-podge, wasteful, selfish, aimless conglomeration of good, useless, and evil projects annually or biennially labeled the "rivers and harbors bill."

The method of the rivers and harbors bill is indefensible, and the results of that method pursued through generations are its own damnation.

The would-be perpetrators of the "pork barrel" are the enemies of the comprehensive program, the enemies of real safety, the enemies of revived navigation.

It is not going too far to say they are, in effect, traitors to the Republic.

Another illuminating editorial on the same general subject criticizes the Army engineers' levees without gloves. It is short and I insert it entire:

[From the Memphis News-Schmitzer, January 12, 1914.]

FLOOD CONTROL.

The consensus of opinion among experts is that the fundamental defect of the Ransdell-Humphreys bill is that, although it professes to be in aid of navigation, it provides for large expenditures for levees, which increase the rapidity and total volume of the caving of the banks into the river. The Chief of Engineers reported to the Secretary of War that until the caving of banks into the Mississippi below St. Louis can be stopped it is practically hopeless to expect any improvement of low-water conditions in the river. In other words, the stream can not be continued navigable.

It is estimated that there are 749 miles of caving banks on the lower Mississippi, from which 9 acres in area by 66 feet deep for each mile is thrown in the stream, which in 50 years would mean half a million acres of land to a depth of 66 feet tumbled in to obstruct navigation.

It is claimed by those high in authority that the Ransdell-Humphreys bill should be entitled "A bill to destroy the navigability of the Mississippi River, and to eventually make it impossible to protect the valley from devastation by floods."

This is just what the railroads want, and have been working for so successfully, and this is why they are behind the levees-only people, who are making so much noise, but which is "all cry and little wool." The more that people investigate the matter the more they see the futility of patchwork and mud pies. Those who have been forced to study the question because it has been brought home to them, like Mayor Reubenstein, of Stockton, Cal., who has had experience in the San Joaquin Valley, know something about flood control. In replying to a communication from Secretary Fox, of the local association, Mayor Reubenstein exposes the fallacies contained in the Ransdell-Humphreys bill, and states: "Fortunately for our country a plan has been submitted that is sufficiently comprehensive to insure an orderly start on this great work, and with ample means for its successful completion."

I would willingly print additional personal letters and opinions regarding the extravagance, waste, and utter uselessness of the present Mississippi River reclamation scheme, but I have already devoted more time to consideration of that river than I first intended. If I have presented sufficient proof of the failure of the present project to awaken interest at either end of the Capitol to prevent wasteful appropriations reaching upward to eight and ten millions of dollars annually, if I can secure a fair hearing

for House concurrent resolution No. 50, which proposes an investigation by an advisory board, if I am able to resurrect the resolution from the committee morgue, to which it has been consigned, together with other resolutions and to which I propose briefly to refer, then I shall feel an effort in exposing the utter wastefulness of the lower Mississippi River reclamation pork barrel has not been in vain.

I am not easily discouraged, Mr. Speaker, and, although I make no prediction as to any investigation into the Mississippi levee scheme, I am confident that ultimate failure and waste will bring about such investigation in the not far-distant future and that condemnation will be visited then upon the heads of Army engineers, instead of upon Congress, where the responsibility should primarily rest.

DIFFERENT PROJECTS HERETOFORE DISCUSSED.

Before I take up one further subject, which I believe is of far more importance than the Mississippi River reclamation project, bad as that is, I desire to say that in my attempt to call attention to the bad features of the project I have been actuated by a purpose to secure, if possible, an investigation of the whole river and harbor proposition. On other occasions I have discussed the \$63,000,000 Ohio River canalization project and the \$20,000,000 Missouri River project, showing the character of traffic in each and the average cost per ton to the Government of freight carried through the locks or over on the Missouri. (Record of April 10, June 3, June 8, and June 19.) In like manner I have tried to show the railway control of terminals at Philadelphia, Providence, Pittsburgh, Cairo, and elsewhere, as appears in my remarks of June 19 last. The chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, who has ever treated me with unvarying courtesy, said to me recently, "Whatever else may be said of your criticism of projects in the rivers and harbors bill, you play no favorites." I have no conscious prejudice on the subject. Legitimate appropriations for actual navigation will not be opposed by anyone, if for public use. I believe contributions from localities benefited should generally be demanded in order to avoid a grab-bag policy; but I am firmly convinced that to pay money out of the Federal Treasury for land reclamation schemes, water-power projects, fertilizer plants, or harbors where public terminals do not exist is wrong and vicious and leads to corruption and to the infamous "pork barrel."

A GREAT ISSUE IS INVOLVED.

I desire to consider briefly one other phase of river and harbor legislation. While the "pork barrel" of 1914 was cut from \$53,000,000 in cash and \$32,000,000 in new continuing projects down to a \$20,000,000 lump-sum pork keg, future barrels will be encountered next year and every year thereafter as long as present conditions exist. A victory of \$33,000,000 saved to the country in cash and \$32,000,000 in new projects begun, or \$65,000,000, is to the credit of those who carried on the fight in the United States Senate, with equal credit to the press and all other agencies which helped to bring about the result.

It may make Army engineers and "pork-barrel" builders more cautious for a time, but we must not delude ourselves into the belief that "pork barrels" will go out of fashion. They will threaten the American people as long as the present system, within and without Congress, continues to exist.

A little over a decade ago a new factor sprang into existence that has served to exaggerate former "pork-barrel" evils. Waterway associations were organized in different parts of the country to urge upon public attention and upon Congress waterway improvements for different projects. The Mississippi Levee Association, the Ohio Valley Improvement Association, the Atlantic Deeper Waterways Association, and a number of other waterway organizations from the Atlantic to the Pacific, largely composed of public-spirited, strong men in each community, all pulling for the particular project in which that association was interested. Soon thereafter it occurred to a promoter that if a trust or monopoly was a good thing in business for those interested, although injurious to the nine hundred and ninety-nine outside of the business monopoly, the same principle could be applied to annual raids on Uncle Sam's Treasury.

AN ANNUAL \$50,000,000 LOOT TRUST.

A trust organization of all the waterway associations was thereupon formed that chose for its battle cry "\$50,000,000 annually for waterways." Good, bad, or indifferent, all were welcome in order to insure a \$50,000,000 annual grab. In order to give force and character to the new waterway loot, trust officials were chosen who had great legislative influence directly and indirectly at Washington.

Quarters were engaged at Washington covering practically the entire floor of one of the largest business blocks in the city, and some of the brightest and ablest publicity agents in the



country were engaged by this \$50,000,000 loot concern, which in its literature declared itself to be "second in importance only to the Congress of the United States."

From an humble beginning it grew in aggressiveness until it dominated the framing of annual "pork barrels." Ten days before the bill was reported from the Senate committee in 1914 this \$50,000,000 annual loot organization sent out from its headquarters in Washington to the press of the country a statement, which read as follows:

While the river and harbor appropriation bill is still held in the Senate Committee on Commerce and the additions made to the House bill are still subject to the secrecy that is put upon members of committees dealing with appropriations until the bills are finally reported to the Senate, enough has been learned to predict that the Senate Committee on Commerce has increased or added to the waterway bills some \$10,000,000.

The prediction was verified to the exact amount. Ten million dollars was loaded on to the House pork barrel of \$43,289,004, and the bill was reported out of committee at \$53,641,600. And it must not be forgotten that some of the worst projects disclosed in the House bill, including the Kissimmee, Oklawaha, and Mattawan Creek, were stricken out of the bill before it was reported by the committee to the Senate.

#### DO THE OFFICERS REPRESENT THE MEMBERS?

Whatever opportunities for securing special inside information are possessed by the Rivers and Harbors Congress or any other organization would be developed by House concurrent resolution No. 49 if an investigation could be had with power to subpoena witnesses and compel the production of books. I do not overlook the fact that great waterway organizations, made up of honest, public-spirited men, are accustomed to choose for administrative offices men of ability and influence in Congress who can be induced to act in that capacity. It is also fair to presume that the affairs of such organizations are managed and determined by those officers during the interim between annual meetings. I am not questioning the sincerity of such officials nor their own honesty of purpose in supporting any project, however wasteful or visionary it may seem to me.

When, however, they decide to throw the influence of the organization in favor of a pork-barrel bill, whose contents are not known to a handful of Members, then I believe they usurp the authority with which they are clothed. When such officials, occupying legislative seats at either end of the Capitol, consent to and approve back-fires, fictitious demands, or threats based on wrong premises, all to be directed at legislators who are trying to honestly and patriotically represent their constituents and their country under their oaths of office, then I believe it is time to expose the worst secret lobby and most powerful influence that ever advocated any appropriation is that which now exists behind the annual pork barrel. If any member of any organization encourages such lobbying, he is equally responsible, but I do not believe the average member has any knowledge of the character of bills that are known as pork barrels, nor do I believe he would authorize anyone to represent him in an effort to force a vicious bill through Congress. It is with no desire to reflect upon the purposes of any organization, with two exceptions, or upon the membership of any organization, in any case, that I submit the following facts, which have induced me to introduce resolutions of inquiry.

#### SOME FACTS CONCERNING THE LOBBY.

Individually, with the handicap of inexperience and no authority to investigate, any first-term Member is helpless to get at many facts, and yet I believe what I am about to submit imperatively demands from us an investigation, in order that Congress and the country may know what secret influences are employed to secure the passage of annual \$50,000,000 river and harbor bills. What amounts of money are used and for what purpose, what political influence is secretly employed to further the barrel's course, and just how far particular interests, including engineers, dredgers, and contractors, are engaged in efforts to push the barrel.

I am prepared to show that to some degree they work together, and it is difficult to determine without an effective investigation just how far the activities of one special interest are separate from other interests that are to be financially benefited by the passage of an annual pork-barrel bill, but the facts submitted speak for themselves.

Mr. Speaker, the dredgers of the country have a special interest in the passage of all river and harbor bills, and are found among the contributors toward waterway organizations that are annually trying to push through a \$50,000,000 pork barrel. I

will present connecting evidence hereafter. Here is a secret, confidential report that is illuminating:

REPORT OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE ATLANTIC AND GULF COAST DREDGE OWNERS' ASSOCIATION, MARCH 13, 1901.

To the Atlantic and Gulf Coast Dredge Owners' Association.

GENTLEMEN: In accordance with the constitution, rules, and by-laws of this association, your board of directors, through your president, present for your consideration herewith their report for the year ending February 13, 1901, adding thereto such recommendations and suggestions as your board have considered during the past year.

The year just closing, the eighteenth year of the association, and the years since its organization have been marked by constant and faithful effort to promote, through the means of general work and enterprise, everything that will make for the good of every operator enrolled in its membership. Measures have been constantly brought to your attention and every effort made to uplift our business and protect it in all proper and legitimate channels.

These efforts have been more or less successful, but always along the line of an earnest endeavor to conserve the real interests of our business.

During the past year your board have especially taken up for consideration the question of its department for fixing prices on work and the allotment of work through the commissioners of that department, and have carefully studied the problems which present themselves in connection with that line of work.

The department in question was not originally contemplated by the founders of this association, nor was it intended as any part of the work for which the association was formed.

The organization had its origin in the recognized desire of many operators in the dredging business for effective cooperation in many important fields of work, where the general interests of their business had long been neglected. It was felt by the progressive men who had invested large amounts of capital in this business that an organization of operators could be effected by the Atlantic coast, whose duty and object would be the closer affiliation of operators, and the combination of the talent and energy in the business for the promotion by all lawful means for the advancement of their business, and to present a united front, supported by united resources, to meet and overcome any and all obstacles then existing or thereafter appearing.

#### IN UNION THERE IS STRENGTH.

It was the old and tried principle, to wit, "In union there is strength" and "A house divided against itself falls," and the keynote of all successful organizations must be that very same principle. Following this rule, the effort of this association should have been confined entirely to meeting and overcoming obstacles which come from without—fighting the common enemy, so to speak. This would mean the promotion of all measures for urging public bodies to undertake public improvements in submarine work, compelling the enactment of reasonable laws governing our work, and the repeal of obnoxious and vexatious laws; experiments in all branches of machinery and devices used in our business, and a general department for furnishing to each member information desired by him regarding any particular work, or concerning which other members may have knowledge, giving in every way to each member the fullest possible data regarding dredging operations on the coast and the history of each piece of work.

So many measures of general interest and value are included in the work that could be successfully performed by an association to the advantage of its members, and so much can be done in the way of promoting good fellowship amongst them by means of this organization, and also by entertaining prominent and influential men at its banquets and through special committees that enumeration here of all these different and important measures is unnecessary.

Any thoughtful man who is engaged in our business can readily see how important it is that an efficient organization of operators should be maintained to promote measures of general interest and value.

#### QUARRELING OVER SPOILS.

Some years after the organization was effected an element entered into its work which has almost crowded out all features of general work and has practically turned the association, which was originally formed for general benefits only, into a special organization for the distribution of work and apportionment of contracts. Starting, as it did, in the desire to combine against outsiders, it has ended in combining against itself; and instead of its members standing together to promote the business of dredging in all its general and important details, as above mentioned, we behold a spectacle of members quarreling one with another over the division of work, and each one complaining that the association is a failure because it does not give to each one all the work that he feels is his due, each member forgetting that the association simply undertook this duty because it was forced upon it, and because other agencies to do that work had failed, and because the operators on the Atlantic coast refused to enter into proper arrangements for dividing work amongst them and preferred to load this work upon the association, a work for which the latter was unfitted, for which it was never intended or formed, and the only excuse for foisting this measure upon it was apparently the dredging operators failed to appreciate that this kind of work was done in other lines of business by special pools organized for no other purpose and specially organized for that purpose alone.

It is time that all thoughtful men in this association pause and consider whether the association is to blame for failing to perform a task entirely beyond its powers or resources, and also whether it would be well for the association to reject this burden and relegate it to proper agencies and take up the duties for which it was organized.

We think it is time that this be done and this bone of contention removed from the midst of our association and the members once more united and working along the lines of common interest. Little of the real value of this association has been demonstrated or developed of recent years and much disagreement and bitterness has come between the members in that time, and all because the association has neglected its real duties and buried itself with false ones. The former would bind its members more firmly together, whereas the latter simply disintegrates our ranks.

It is certainly time that this "Jonah" be thrown overboard and left to the tender mercies of some sufficient "whale" or "pool" and the association be permitted to again bend to its task and resume its long interrupted voyage.

In presenting these views to the members, your board feel that they are simply pointing out the pitfall into which this association has become entangled, and which has retarded its growth and usefulness for

some years and has brought upon it an immense amount of work foreign to its proper duties. Much of the dissatisfaction has been due to this very cause, and members have been alienated whose assistance was of the greatest value to us. We have seen the camel crowd into our tent and force out everything else, and it is time that this fruitless and thankless task, which was put upon the association, be now put off, and the department created for the allotment and apportionment of dredging work and contracts be abandoned and all rules pertaining thereto be repealed.

The association should, on the other hand, favor the creation of pools in each district formed upon the lines of other successful business arrangements of like character.

The association as a whole will then confine itself to legitimate business of acquiring work and promoting the resources of members for doing work, leaving to the separate pools the business of dividing up that work at good prices.

#### TO THROW ALL RESOURCES ON PROJECTS.

We count in this association the membership and influence of every man engaged in the business; each one has something of value to us in the way of ideas, talent, energy, or influence, and it is the work of the association and its proper object and function to use these various factors for the benefit of the whole membership, and to throw upon any desired point the full resources of the association. In this way and by turning its steps in the right direction and with the full confidence and cooperation which it would then have from all its members, there no longer being any grounds for contention or rivalry amongst one another, when once this department of allotment was abandoned, the association will once more resume its proper place and perform many duties of the highest use and importance to its members.

The cost of its work would be distributed, and no member would have any cause for regretting that he was enrolled in its ranks.

If these views meet with your approval, your board would earnestly urge that, at least for a time, the district commission and all rules pertaining thereto be abrogated and discontinued; that the board of directors be instructed to arrange and appoint a series of committees, chosen of their own ranks, as well as from the entire membership, giving to each committee certain specified duties, which will include all matters which it is to the interest of the association to have promoted and studied. These committees should report from time to time to the board of directors, and the latter, being a representative body from all parts of the coast, would be most efficient in taking up and promoting all suggestions and measures requiring action.

No expense should be incurred by the committees, except as specially authorized by the directors from time to time and in cases where the necessity for such expenditures is apparent.

The board should organize a bureau of information, which would furnish to each member at regular intervals a synopsis of what is going on in the way of dredging operations on the coast, improvements in machinery or methods of doing work, with descriptions of such improvements, locations, etc., and the general work being done by and through committees and in the board of directors; this and such other additional information as may suggest itself.

This bureau should be in charge of a competent man, whose business is to procure and intelligently transmit matters of interest.

The question of insurance has never been adequately considered, and some measure should be taken up and carefully considered, so that a general scheme of insurance could be devised to secure some reduction of the large premium now paid by members to the insurance companies. Very little, if any, work of this kind has been done in our business, and it is believed that a system of employment of representative agents for our insurance would be found profitable and a great saving.

#### DREDGERS NEGLECTED THE PORK BARREL.

The lack of association methods and the failure to use the means in our hands for the general good was forcibly illustrated recently in the river and harbor bill, where absolutely no effort was made by the association to procure any amendment to the bill or any provision inserted therein for its benefit.

It also appears in the case recently of certain collisions which occurred in the Savannah River, where the law at present provides that a dredge occupying a channel in navigable waters is doing so at its peril, and no damages resulting to the said dredge can be recovered. These and a great many instances could be cited to show the neglect that general interest of dredging men is receiving at this time and emphasizes the necessity for proper action by the association, to wit, such as this one was intended to be and should be.

Your board of directors desire to assure this association and its members that they have devoted their best efforts, during the year just ended, to a consideration of all matters affecting the interests and business of those for whom they have acted. They have appreciated that the duties which they assumed in accepting the offices of directors required them to give the necessary time to consideration of the matters entrusted to them, and they looked over the entire field of co-operative work, and have determined that the association could be made of great value to the members if conducted on the lines heretofore specified.

They are also of the opinion that the work which the association has been attempting to do, namely, the allotment of work among members, has been entirely contrary to the spirit of this organization, and has proven a stumbling block in all its efforts to promote the general interests of its members. We feel that by means of thorough reforms in our methods, such as has been outlined, that the organization will rapidly add to its membership, and soon include all the operators on the Atlantic and Gulf coasts; that there will no longer be any reason why anyone engaged in the business should not join with us in our efforts to promote the business and encourage the giving of work by those having it in their power to do so, as well as the many other features which have been touched upon in this our report.

The board have held meetings on the second Wednesday of every month except the months of July and August, during which latter months the constitution provides a recess shall be taken, and the meetings have been well attended.

#### BOARD IS TO WORK FOR PORK BARRELS.

Your board feels regret that the river and harbor bill has failed of passage, and considers it all the more important that the association should be organized for the purpose of adding its influence to urging work by municipal organizations and bodies, and doing all in their power to create offerings of work in the various ports of entry and harbors. It is only by persistent effort that the loss entailed upon us by the failure of the harbor bill can in any way be compensated for. Your board further wishes to emphasize their regret that the annual banquet of the association has been allowed to go by default for two or three years. These entertainments do not entail any serious

expense upon the association, but they do create the greatest possible prestige for our business in the estimation of those whose favor it is to our advantage to gain. Influential public men and men of business affairs having to do with transportation companies and steamship lines are entertained by us on these occasions with the greatest possible benefit to our business—municipal officers, heads of departments, Members of Congress and of legislatures—and their favor and interest is legitimately gained and has been found to be of the greatest value when circumstances required it. The expense of our entertainment is wisely expended, and brings an adequate return for every dollar so spent.

We might also add that the occasion also affords an opportunity for members to meet on holiday terms, and encourages in every way good fellowship and kindly feelings among them. It is therefore to be hoped that in another year this banquet will be again a feature of the association.

The work of the association has been so largely confined to the burdensome details of allotment and district commission work during the past year that very little of general interest has developed.

We have done the best we could with the allotment problem, and have done even better than an association of this kind could have been expected to do; but we hope that the whole matter will be relegated to other agencies, and the efforts of this association left untrammelled for the coming year to perform the duties for which it is properly fitted.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

Dated New York, March 13, 1901.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS,  
By FRANK A. FURST, President.

SECRETARY'S OFFICE,  
New York City, April 25, 1901.

DEAR SIR: The Atlantic and Gulf Coast Dredge Owners' Association cordially tender to you an invitation to join them in their work of promoting the interests of dredging men upon the Atlantic coast.

It has been the object of this association during the 18 years of existence to provide a means of acquaintance and intercourse amongst men engaged in the same kind of business, to promote good fellowship amongst them, and encourage all movements that will provide work and stimulate large undertakings in the improvement of waterways.

The association has been of great assistance to its members in these respects, and is the only organization existing among dredging operators having these objects in view. By assembling together operators from all points on the coast the combined talent, energy, resources, and influence of the various members, coupled with the long experience of the association, is placed at the disposal of the members for the ultimate benefit of each, and for the promotion of measures for their interest.

The association further aims at promoting social intercourse between operators and customers and influential men by its annual banquets, and with great success in the past. It does not hinder or control any operator in his business or in the prices he may obtain for his work, but leaves all individual matters of that character to the members themselves, without interference, seeking to advance the interests of each member through general features which build up and improve the general business in which all are engaged, and where these matters can be fully discussed and acted upon when necessary.

Your consideration is therefore cordially requested and your application for membership will be met with the fullest explanation of our work. The expense of membership is reasonable.

Hoping to hear from you, I am,

Very truly, yours,

JOHN F. CLARK,  
Clerk of the Board.

By order of the board.

Mr. Speaker, if the report I have presented is authentic, and such an organization as this exists, having for its purpose the advancement of "pork barrels" through Congress for the mutual interest and benefit of its members, it is time that an investigation of such secret influences was had.

As bearing upon this proposition I offer for consideration a short clipping which purports to have been taken from the Atlantic Deep Waterways Bulletin of 1913:

#### THE PRESIDENT GETS A GOOD JOB.

Frank A. Furst, president of the Maryland Dredging Co., was one of the principal figures at the annual meeting of the Dredge Owners' Protective Association, of which he is president, held in New York last month.

Mr. Furst's company is digging the canal across Cape Cod, which is a link in the chain of waterways along the Atlantic coast. In addition the Maryland Dredging Co. is draining the Everglades of Florida. Mr. Furst spoke of both of these projects before the association, and told some very interesting stories in connection with the difficulties encountered in the Everglades project.

Will it be reasonably questioned that a committee might get at some interesting facts regarding influences behind "pork barrels" if possessed of authority to subpoena witnesses for that purpose? It must be admitted that sufficient information has been offered on which to base proceedings, and there is more that can be furnished when the committee reports out my resolution for investigation and provides the machinery for its conduct.

Hereafter, in its proper place, I will connect up the dredgers' organization with kindred spirits; but I wish to precede such action by disclosing certain other activities in favor of the 1914 pork barrel which are hand in glove with the dredgers. They were exposed in the Senate on September 19 by Senator KENYON, who quoted from a back-fire reaching into my own district. He said:

The National Rivers and Harbors Congress has been a pretty busy institution in creating the same kind of sentiment; and it does seem to me that associations that are trying to create sentiment to influence Members of Congress are coming very near the lobby proposition. Some time ago, on July 27, 1914, they sent out a letter from Washington which I shall ask to insert in the Record and only read portions of it at this time.



The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEA of Tennessee in the chair). Without objection, permission is granted.

Mr. KENYON. I thank the Chair. The letter is as follows:

THE BACK FIRE IN WISCONSIN.

NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS.

Washington Office, July 27, 1914.

CENTRAL LUMBER CO., Hudson, Wis.

GENTLEMEN: One of the most violent attacks, if not the most violent, that has ever been made upon the policy of improving our national waterways has for some time been in progress in the Senate of the United States, supported by a portion of the daily press and certain periodicals of wide circulation.

Since 1910, when the policy of annual, instead of triennial, river and harbor bills was adopted, the estimates submitted by the Army engineers call only for the amount which can probably be expended during the succeeding fiscal year. To provide for continuous work on projects already under way, the pending bill should have been passed before July 1; and already, because of exhaustion of funds, work has been suspended on a number of improvements, and with every day of delay in the passage of the bill the number of suspensions will increase.

But that is not the worst of the situation. For many reasons Senators are anxious to get away from Washington; other legislation of great importance, and concerning which there is a wide difference of opinion, is yet to be considered. The river and harbor bill has had no right of way; it has received only brief and occasional consideration, and has now been definitely displaced by the trust-regulation bills, and can receive no further consideration until these have been finally disposed of. The rules of the Senate allow any Senator to speak on any subject to the limit of his endurance. In 1901 Senator Carter, unaided, talked a river and harbor bill to death. Several Senators are cooperating in the present attack. Some of them have stated directly that they consider the bill so bad that it ought to be defeated, and the tactics which have been pursued thus far look very much like a filibuster.

Out of about 350 waterway projects, only 15 are under the continuing-contract system. On all the rest, if the pending bill fails of passage, work must be stopped for at least a year; costly machinery will rust in idleness; efficient working forces built up during the past four years will be disorganized and scattered; uncompleted work will be damaged or destroyed; investments in terminals will be rendered unproductive; the movement will under way in many parts of the country, for the restoration of navigation on our inland waterways will receive a serious check; the deepening of our ocean harbors will be delayed, while our foreign competitors take the cream of the benefits of the Panama Canal, and the railways will retain their monopoly of transportation for at least another year, meantime redoubling their efforts to retain it for all time by preventing the completion of a national system of connected waterways and harbors.

#### MATHEMATICAL ACCURACY OF AN ARMY ENGINEER.

Along with the charge that this bill is "the most vicious and vulnerable" that has ever been framed must be considered the statement of Gen. Kingman, the Chief of Engineers. "My judgment is that there is less than one-half of 1 per cent of 'pork' in the river and harbor bill now pending in the Senate," and the assertions of Senators SIMMONS, SMITH of Michigan, and RANDALL—all members of the Commerce Committee and of the subcommittee which devoted weeks of conscientious study to the framing of the bill—who have stated on the floor of the Senate that it does not include a single item, which is not fully justified and that there is not one cent's worth of 'pork' in it.

One of the enemies of the bill has intimated that it is highly improper for the people of a community to seek to promote the improvement of the waterways or harbors in which they are particularly interested or for a national organization with an office in Washington to request that any letters or telegrams shall be sent to Senators or Representatives regarding pending legislation.

Nevertheless I consider it my duty to inform you that unless the friends of waterways besmirch themselves the bill is likely to fail, because after a month or more of debate on the trust-regulation bills through the heat of a Washington summer Senators will be so worn out that it will be very hard to keep a quorum present to consider other legislation, no matter how important it may be.

In the opinion of the writer the failure of the river and harbor bill would be nothing short of a national disaster. Whether you will take any steps to avert this threatened disaster is a matter which must be left for you to decide.

Very truly, yours,

S. A. THOMPSON, Secretary.

This is sent to a lumber company in Wisconsin.

THE BACK-FIRE IN IOWA.

Senator KENYON continues:

From my own State I am in receipt of a newspaper setting forth some of the correspondence received by the mayor of this city on the river from Mr. Thompson, secretary of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. In that letter "the mayor is urged to use his influence in keeping the Iowa Congressmen and Senators at Washington in order that a quorum may be had up to the final hour of adjournment. If a quorum of the Members of Congress can be maintained, it is contended that the bill can readily be enacted into law. With Muscatine on the Mississippi River, the following appeal addressed to Mayor Kern should be of interest locally."

This very interesting document refers to the question of Senator PENROSE to the Democratic leader, Senator KERN, as to the passage of a river and harbor bill; and the answer of the Senator from Indiana apparently did not satisfy this distinguished secretary of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, because he says in this letter:

"You will note that the agreement was not that the bill should be passed, but that it should be disposed of, which is a very different matter. It is very evident that the group of Senators who have been conducting the filibuster against the bill intend to continue their opposition. And in private conversation Senator KERN strongly emphasized the statement that has already been repeatedly made from this office, viz: 'The passage of the river and harbor bill depends absolutely upon the maintenance of a quorum both in the Senate and the House.'"

I do not assume that this gentleman had any authority to speak for the Senator from Indiana. He says:

"Do not make the mistake of supposing that the House has nothing more to do with the matter. Many amendments have been made to the bill as passed by the House, which makes it necessary that the bill, when passed by the Senate, shall be sent to conference, and the report of the conference committee must receive an affirmative vote, both in the House and the Senate, before the bill will be finally passed."

"Weariness from the almost continuous sessions during the past two years"—no reference is made here to the weariness of night sessions—"the near approach of the fall campaign"—that was in July—"and

many other reasons make it entirely natural that Senators and Members should be anxious to leave Washington as soon as the trust bills and emergency legislation made necessary by the war in Europe shall be disposed of. Nothing but the pressure of public opinion will insure the maintenance of a quorum until the river and harbor bill is passed."

We are going to bring a pressure now, not of public opinion but against public opinion, to bring the Senators here under the order by means of special sergeants at arms, under reasonable compensation, I assume.

"That pressure must be exerted and the quorum maintained, for the failure of the bill would be nothing short of a national disaster."

#### LOOK OUT FOR THE SHORT SESSION.

"Thus far those who have conducted the filibuster have made only general charges instead of specific criticisms. They and certain newspapers and periodicals which have approved their course seem to want not to eliminate objectionable items, but to defeat the bill as a whole. It should be remembered that it is ten times as easy to defeat a bill at the short session of Congress as at the long session. If the bill of 1914 is defeated, there is little hope for one next year."

"Petitions, memorials, and resolutions adopted by commercial organizations are all effective means of influencing Senators and Representatives, but the most effective method is a flood of genuinely personal letters and telegrams from their constituents. Duplicated letters and telegrams in identical language will not answer—in fact, do harm rather than good—but no Member of either the House or the Senate will fail to heed hundreds or thousands of letters and telegrams which are evidently written by those whose names are signed thereto."

#### THE OREGON BACK-FIRE.

This is one of the wisest diplomats that this association has in its service that it ever has been my pleasure to observe.

Now, that is not all; and I want to make my case against this method of affecting public sentiment, in view of this criticism here.

Out in Astoria their paper, the Daily Budget, of September 1, 1914—which has been blue-penciled and sent, I suppose, to most Members of Congress—contains "the pleasing language with which Capt. Wilson I. Davenney, field secretary of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, described his impressions at the rooms of the Port of Columbia Commercial Club. The meeting was under the auspices of the Columbia and Snake River Waterways Association, which was joined by every commercial organization in the city."

This distinguished representative, who was engaged in the business of creating public sentiment, said to these people, among other things, this—and I will read only a very short portion of it:

"You people have a laudable ambition. Everywhere I have been today I hear your demand for nothing less than 40 feet in the channel across the shoal at the mouth of the river. Such an object is a commendable one, and when accomplished will place you on the great international highway of commerce. It is an ambition that looks big for a little community like this, when one considers that New York, with all her wealth and influence, has been working for years on a similar project, and to-day there is only that amount of water in the Ambrose Channel. But you can attain your goal if you but persist, and the Rivers and Harbors Congress will help you, as it is through that body you have a means of reaching the legislative branch of the Government, with the backing of the representative interests of the entire Nation."

"The improvement of river channels"

Says this field agent—

"and of harbors does not come by accident, but in accordance with a well-defined and studied plan. The Rivers and Harbors Congress is the center around which that plan is worked out. It is an organization of the live ones of the country, who realize the importance of improving our means of transportation and lowering its cost."

And in the letters which they send out they have a motto, "Second only in importance to the Congress of the United States."

The result thus far has been the passing of four annual appropriation bills, not including the one which is now pending. It is strange how few people understand the problem of transportation and the portion of its cost which each must pay, as well as the bearing which our waterways have upon it. Transportation cost is a concealed tax, and every commodity must stand its portion. Search the world over and you find the cities which are the centers of activities are those located adjacent to bodies of navigable waters. With due deference to the Interstate Commerce Commission, it may be fairly said that improved waterways are the best regulators of transportation rates."

Then the distinguished gentleman proceeds to consider that to some extent, and says:

"The passage of the rivers and harbors measure is one which concerns the commercial welfare of the entire country. It is not one based on selfish motives, but for fostering the industrial development of the land. Any Congressman, any Senator, or any newspaper which opposes it is an enemy to your advancement."

Here was the great argument that this gentleman presented; but that kind of argument does not always carry weight with some Oregonians.

"The bill gives to Oregon in cash and commitments one-eighth of the full sum to be appropriated. Why, then, should anyone here oppose it?"

True; why should they? Why should anyone in any State, receiving any part of the money for use in that State, oppose great appropriation measures? That is the vice of the whole thing. That is the kind of public sentiment that this particular institution seems to be unconsciously building up.

#### WHERE DOES THE MONEY COME FROM?

Now, where does the money come from to carry on this great propaganda throughout this country? Why should it be necessary for large sums of money to be collected and spent in giving dredgers' association banquets to influential citizens, as I have read here from their statements? I do not want to neglect to read the condemnation of that from the New York Waterway Association, which seems to have a different conception of affairs. I want to use and get into the record in this case, which I am trying to preserve for appeal to what I consider a higher court—the court of the people of this country, who are going to pass on this question eventually—a letter which I am authorized to use, to Congressman FREAK, of Wisconsin, who fought this river and harbor bill in the House almost unopposed and alone, actuated by a public spirit that seldom has been witnessed in the Halls of the American Congress. This letter is from Mr. Richard M. McCann, the publisher of Waterways and Commerce, a monthly magazine devoted to restoration of the American merchant marine and the establishment of world peace. In it he says:

"I inclose herewith original subscription lists obtained from a canvasser named Mr. John M. Williams, of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, who received 50 per cent for obtaining the amounts set op-



posited each name. As you will see, the subscriptions cover 1908, 1909, 1910, 1911, and 1912."

#### WHERE THE MONEY GOES.

Here is a canvasser—if this authority is correct, and I assume it is—who is collecting money to be used in creating public sentiment and receiving 50 per cent of what he collects; and these letters are going out, criticizing Members of Congress for the stand they may take as to this river and harbor bill, and paying the expenses of field representatives who go out and make their speeches and urge the passage of the measure.

We find that in 1910 the subscribers were the following:

List of 1910 subscribers from State of New Jersey to National Rivers and Harbors Congress.

A. B. Ayers, Newark, N. J., 358 Ogden Street, paid Sept. 6-----	\$25
Builders' Material Supply Co., Henry W. Sayre, president, Newark, N. J., paid Sept. 6-----	25
Balback Smelting & Refining Co., Edward Randolph, secretary Newark, N. J., paid Aug. 17-----	50
Dr. M. R. Brinkman, Hackensack, N. J., paid Feb. 15-----	5
P. Ballantine & Sons, Newark, N. J., paid Feb. 12-----	10
James Crowell, 364 Ogden Street, Newark, N. J., paid Aug. 29-----	50
John J. Cone, 532 Bergen Avenue, Jersey City, N. J., paid June 22-----	5
Columbia Insurance Co., Jersey City, N. J., paid Feb. 12-----	10
Eastwood Wire Manufacturing Co., John H. Eastwood, treasurer, Belleville, N. J., paid Sept. 10-----	25
James S. Higbie, care of James R. Sayre, jr., & Co., Newark, N. J., paid Mar. 9 (for 1910 and 1911)-----	5
William A. Jones & Son, Newark, N. J., paid Sept. 10-----	25
Lister's Agricultural Chemical Works, Newark, N. J., paid Aug. 18-----	50
Marshall & Co., Newark, N. J., paid Sept. 10-----	50
Board of Trade, Newark, N. J., paid Oct. 3-----	100
Newark Express & Transportation Co., J. H. Wood, president, Newark, N. J., paid Sept. 24-----	25
The Nalrn Linoleum Co., Kearney, N. J., paid Feb. 7-----	10
Philadelphia-Trenton-New York Deeper Waterways Association, C. Arthur Metzger, secretary, Trenton, N. J., paid June 14-----	100
Pasquali River Protective Association, William A. Jones, jr., secretary, Newark, N. J., paid Dec. 16-----	25
Mitchell B. Perkins, Beverly, N. J., paid Jan. 24-----	5
George F. Reeve, 88 Front Street, Newark, N. J., paid May 23-----	5
Standard Oil Co., C. E. Young, manager, Newark, N. J., paid Sept. 12-----	25
J. C. Smith & Wallace Co., Newark, N. J., paid Sept. 6-----	25
James R. Sayre, jr., & Co., Newark, N. J., paid Sept. 6-----	20
Peter Shields, Cape May, N. J., paid Jan. 27-----	5
Trenton Chamber of Commerce, Trenton, N. J., paid Nov. 16-----	25
Tomkins Bros., Newark, N. J., paid Aug. 3-----	30
Van Kuren & Sons, Newark, N. J., paid Aug. 29-----	10
Walsh & Sons Co., Newark, N. J., paid Sept. 10-----	10
George W. Tomkins, Newark, N. J., paid Aug. 3-----	20

I have also a list for other years, which possibly it will not be necessary to insert in the RECORD.

#### THE OHIO BACK-FIRE.

Continuing his exposure of the secret back fire behind the pork barrel, Senator KENYON said:

Then I want to call attention to a letter along this same line of influence, and it is one of threats with relation to this river and harbor bill. This is a letter to Senator BURTON from the G. H. Williams Co., E. P. Lord, secretary, of Cleveland, Ohio, and I am going to read it, because I want it in the RECORD:

"CLEVELAND, OHIO, September 10, 1914.

"HON. THEODORE E. BURTON,

"United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

"DEAR SIR: As manufacturers of special machinery used very largely by river and harbor contractors and United States engineers doing that class of work, we desire to express the wish that the opposition to the passage of the rivers and harbors bill now before the Senate be so modified or withdrawn that the full passage of the bill may be assured at the earliest moment.

"It seems to us that the manufacturers of the country at large are suffering sufficiently through the general depression and lack of business of all kinds, and that there should be nothing done by the Government that would add to the troubles we already have.

"A very large volume of our business comes from the contractors who are working on dam contracts along the rivers, and also by United States engineers on river and harbor work in all sections of the country. We have quite recently been following up our previous orders from these various sources to obtain some expression as to when we might anticipate further business, and in every case thus far we have received one and the same reply, and that is that all construction work in their district has been suspended on account of the failure of Congress to pass the rivers and harbors bill and that they would not be in the market for clamshell buckets or other material in our line until this bill passed; and from the extreme South, where we do considerable business, they go so far as to say that all field operations have practically ceased in that section for lack of funds; thousands of men are lying idle, and the contractors express their determination that they will never buy anything made in Ohio owing to the fact that our Senators are strenuously opposing the rivers and harbors bill."

So here comes this insidious influence working around through boycott channels to try to stop Senators who may be honest from opposing this measure:

"From this particular class of business we have been receiving a very large bulk and volume of our trade and which now is absolutely flat. We do not have one order on our books, and the necessity of closing down our plant stares us in the face; and if this harbors and rivers bill is not passed and all the vast amount of work of this kind is cut off, and the large contractors, who are our best customers, are obliged to suspend operations, there will be no further business for us until a change takes place. We therefore ask your aid in seeing that this bill is passed, and that at as early a date as possible.

"Respectfully submitted.

"THE G. H. WILLIAMS CO.,  
"E. P. LORD, Secretary."

#### THE BIG STICK USED IN OHIO.

At this point the Iowa Senator was interrupted in his reading by an Ohio Senator:

Mr. POMERENE, Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEA of Tennessee in the chair). Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. KENYON, I do.

Mr. POMERENE. The Senator from Iowa has just read a letter which was written to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] by the G. H. Williams Co., of which E. P. Lord is secretary. I received, perhaps about the same day, identically the same letter. Here is an Ohio firm, I am ashamed to confess it, that writes to the Senators of that State asking them to stop all opposition to this bill, which involves the expenditure of about \$53,000,000, for what reason? Because the bill is right? No. Because the items therein provided for are proper items of expenditure by the Government? No. But the single reason urged is that this firm of manufacturers, out of the \$53,000,000 of expenditure from the Public Treasury, may be able to get orders for a few clamshell buckets, and they are inspired to write this letter because, they say, there are some contractors in the South who are interested in this measure.

I am not holding the South responsible for this. I am not going to question the high purposes that lie back of the authorship of most of the items in this bill. Most of these items, so far as I am familiar with reference to this bill by the contents of this letter. It is so contain manufacturers and contractors attempting to influence public servants in the performance of their duty, and, in substance, asking them to disregard their sworn oaths, language falls me in my effort to either describe the letter or the writer of it, even if he is from my State, or the southern contractors whose correspondence seems to have inspired it. Judging their moral and civic character by this letter, they must, to say the least, be lacking in a proper conception of public duty.

Mr. KENYON. The letter the Senator has is identical, I assume, with the one I read.

Mr. POMERENE. I understood from my colleague that he had such a letter, and while the Senator from Iowa was reading it I compared the one I have in my hand with it. It is identically the same.

I am not going to be deterred in the position I shall hereafter take with reference to this bill by the contents of this letter. It is so contemptible in its spirit that it deserves to be treated with silence. There have been other matters that have come to my attention. I have been waited upon and told that this bill was right in all respects, and that I should vote for it as it is. I am not in the habit of accepting dictation from men who come to me in that spirit. I recognize that it is a very great honor to represent the great State of Ohio on the floor of this Chamber, but I am more honored by the opposition of men who can write a letter of this kind than I can be honored by a seat in this Chamber.

The evidence introduced by Senator KENYON includes letters written to Wisconsin and to Iowa by the secretary of the Rivers and Harbors Congress on the pork barrel. The contents speak for themselves.

In the Astoria paper of September 1, quoted by Senator KENYON, it was set forth in a half page article that Capt. Wilson I. Davenny, field agent of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, was on hand at a waterway meeting urging that Senators be kept on the job until the pork-barrel bill could be passed, and a strong resolution was thereupon passed by the association urging Oregon Senators to support the pork barrel and not adjourn until the task was finished.

In the correspondence of Secretary Thompson the records will undoubtedly show that the G. H. Williams Co., of Cleveland, was given to understand that an impending "disaster is threatened," and the Williams Co. out in Cleveland demands that "opposition to the passage of the rivers and harbors bill now before the Senate be so modified or withdrawn that the full passage of the bill may be assured at the earliest possible moment."

It is significant that both Ohio Senators received a copy of the demand, indicating that the same influence exerted in Oregon was working in Ohio, and all under the direction of the Rivers and Harbors Congress officials, who were in Washington directing a campaign in favor of the bill. What wonder that the Senator from Ohio, who had taken no part in the debate, should rise in his place on the floor of the Senate to express his indignation at the general tenor of the letter and at other agencies that were active in pressing the bill.

These activities in the press, through letters, and by traveling agents are of such character that they invite the attention of a Federal Congress that is to be relieved from intelligent consideration of a \$50,000,000 annual pork barrel after it has once been prepared by the officials of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, who style themselves "second only in importance to the Congress of the United States."

#### THE MISSISSIPPI LAND RECLAMATION BIG STICK.

An interesting phase of waterway activities is afforded by loud protests against swinging of a big stick wielded by the lower Mississippi River land reclamationists. This charge does not come from irresponsible sources, but from an association presided over by one of the ablest Members upon this floor and one of the most vigorous champions of the intracoastal system, Hon. J. HAMPTON MOORE, of Philadelphia. The association supports a monthly journal devoted to waterways. In a recent number, published in February, 1914, the following vigorous protest speaks volumes for the effective work now being secretly carried on for the \$60,000,000 Humphreys-Ransdell bill. It reads as follows:

Business men in the Eastern States may not realize the systematic campaign which is being waged from points in the Mississippi Valley to dragoon everyone into the ranks for an unprecedentedly large and continuing appropriation for the Mississippi River. Some of these let-



ters amount practically to threats of transfer of business unless eastern houses fall in line and go on record with their Congressmen in favor of the project. Without present discussion of the merits of the bill, and for obvious reasons omitting names, the following letter sent us by an eastern correspondent is herewith reproduced as a matter of information:

"GENTLEMEN: Will not your firm kindly aid in the matter of securing national legislation such as will prevent a recurrence of the disastrous floods of 1912 and 1913 on the lower Mississippi River?"

"A measure known as the Ransdell-Humphreys bill, providing for the expenditure of \$60,000,000 by the National Government to complete the levee system during the next five years, and thereby prevent these disastrous floods, is now before Congress.

"This measure was framed in accordance with the plans and recommendations of the Army engineers and provides the only practicable and feasible means of solving the problem.

"The people of the region affected have already contributed \$70,000,000, and it is considered but right that the Nation contribute its share toward controlling the flood waters from so great a part of the country on a stream of such national magnitude.

"Letters from your firm asking the delegation from your State to support the measure in Congress will help us very greatly; and, as our loss is your loss and our prosperity your prosperity, we hope that you will feel a personal interest in the matter."

CONGRESSMEN MUST FAIRLY DIVIDE "PORK."

"For ways that are dark" this threatening campaign is original. "Our loss is your loss and our prosperity is your prosperity." Was this a reference to mutual claims upon the pork barrel, or did it mean that southern business houses were about to secede from northern connections unless the Pennsylvania Congressmen came across with their support?

The Waterways Journal, from the City of Brotherly Love, understands it to be the demand of a legislative highwayman organization, and it protests against this unprofessional campaign carried on by the Ransdell-Humphreys bill. With the ethical standards of either organization we are not concerned, but what other interesting leads might be developed by an investigation of the \$150,000 promotion fund or the wielding of a big stick whereby hesitating Congressmen are forced to join in an irresistible political push on the pork barrel.

A NEW YORK CANAL BIG STICK.

The Mississippi River incident occurred in February, before the river and harbor bill was made up and presented to the House. Thereafter it passed the House, and when introduced in the Senate it contained \$9,000,000 for the lower Mississippi and also generous appropriations for the intracoastal system. The bill was riddled in the Senate by the ablest waterway expert in the country and by other able men and then defeated through the aid of an independent press.

The \$20,000,000 substitute is now before the House and the distinguished gentleman from Philadelphia, Mr. MOORE, editor of the journal that so properly resented intimidation from lower Mississippi River sources, has just stated, amidst applause:

Sitting in 25-story skyscrapers in New York, we have seen great editors writing editorials approving the filibusters and giving out sensational statements to all the people that because of a "pork barrel" a rivers and harbors bill should not pass. [Applause.] The people of the Hudson Valley set some fires under those editorial offices, they set some fires under the magazine writers, and I question whether they will be quite so conspicuous hereafter in cutting out their own appropriations in New York and up the Hudson as they have been heretofore.

And so, Mr. Speaker, the New York papers and the New York magazines have been muzzled, and through self-interest in the pork barrel will hereafter remain mum over the \$50,000,000 "humbug and steal," as it was termed by Senator TILLMAN when it did not reach one-half of its present proportions.

MUZZLING THE PRESS OF THE COUNTRY.

I realize the power that exists behind the "pork barrel," a power that impels Members to remain silent and support the measure; but when that power reaches out and controls the press of the land by methods as dangerous and far-reaching as those employed by Louisiana land reclamationists on Pennsylvania business men, then it is time for the country to revolt.

In Philadelphia was once written an immortal document that declared this people to be free and independent. That spirit is still found in Philadelphia, as I propose to show.

At the First Congress of the United States, held in 1789 in New York City, there was adopted the first amendment to the Federal Constitution, which read:

Congress shall make no law \* \* \* abridging the freedom of speech or of the press.

A power denied to Congress is proposed now to be exercised by secret influences in order to pass \$50,000,000 "pork barrels." Whether the New York newspapers or magazines can be smothered remains to be seen, but I quote from the shadows of Independence Hall a brief editorial published in the Philadelphia Inquirer a few days ago. This utterance from a great newspaper indicates that the smothering process did not begin in Philadelphia. The Philadelphia Inquirer said editorially on September 16:

Gaily the debate over the thieves bill, politely known as the rivers and harbors appropriations, goes on in the Senate. Having cut out

appropriations of genuine merit to serve the interests of southern statesmen, it is interesting to watch the antics of our southern friends in their efforts to defend the great steal. \* \* \* The South is in the saddle sure enough.

The Chicago Tribune of September 10 says:

If the rivers and harbors appropriations were 50 per cent pure, they would be opposed by uncompromising Congressmen determined that filching should not have recognized place in the process of Government. Until the question of internal improvement can be taken up honestly by Congress these bills ought to be opposed.

I could quote from the Washington Times, New York Sun, the Press, the Times, the Philadelphia Press, Cleveland Plain Dealer, and innumerable papers that ask Congress to swat the barrel.

Collier's National Magazine, La Follette's, Pierson's, Chap-pel's, World's Work, Saturday Evening Post, Harper's, and other periodicals have had strong editorial utterances on the subject. Are all these newspapers and magazines to be silenced? I do not believe so.

A WAR CRY FOR \$50,000,000 ANNUAL LOOT.

In order that we may fully understand the purposes of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress which, according to its field secretary, Mr. Davenny, is a "body through which you have a means of reaching the legislative branch of the Government," I quote the first provision of its constitution affecting its purposes:

ART. II. Objects: The objects of this congress shall be the collection, preparation, and presentation to the Congress of the United States of such statistics and other information bearing upon the question of improvement of rivers and harbors of all the Nation as will secure for such purpose an annual appropriation by the said Congress of not less than \$50,000,000.

This remarkable provision that commits all the members of this "second congress" to an annual \$50,000,000 loot of the Federal Treasury, irrespective of character or merit of projects, is the tie which binds.

No more scandalous proposition was ever advanced by any organization in the history of the country.

If the Army officers or Navy officers organized to secure a specific fund from the Federal Treasury every year, there would be vacancies in the Army and Navy that could not be credited to the plucking board.

If any general or admiral was president of such board and directed his paid agents to organize a back-fire whereby the Federal Congress would be compelled to pass a "pork barrel" a large part of which was waste, if such a thing could happen, what floods of patriotic oratory would overflow the pages of the RECORD. How Members would properly resent such public or secret interference.

The Rivers and Harbors Congress is a benevolent organization that demanded over \$53,000,000 in 1914 in addition to \$6,990,000 previously covered by the sundry civil bill, and of that \$53,000,000 the sum of \$10,500,000 was to go into a river that had lost 80 per cent of its traffic within the past score of years, and of that amount six-sevenths, or \$9,000,000, was to be expended on the lower Mississippi River on what competent engineers already quoted, term a "land-reclamation scheme."

A PRESIDENT'S BATTLE CRY.

In his annual address before a recent convention of the congress, its distinguished president and a national legislator of renown, who presides over this second congress, made the following strange prophecy in 1911 when announcing his battle cry to Congress:

Dense ignorance as to the benefits of water transportation exists in many quarters. Congress is committed to an annual river and harbor bill only by the precedent of the past two years. Thirty millions a year is a great advance over twenty millions, but it is still far below our battle cry of "fifty millions per annum." Nor can our fondest enthusiast say that we have fully established the wise, definite waterway policy we set out to secure. In spite of our great success, much remains to be done. But the coveted goal is almost in sight. Let us struggle hard for a few years longer and victory will be sure to crown our efforts.

[Applause.]

Reharking back to a prior "congress," I find the same distinguished president and national legislator recorded as saying to his congress:

I am glad to see so many Members of the American Congress in this hall. These Senators and Representatives are here to receive instructions from you. They are your servants and will do what you wish. [Applause.]

Mind you, gentlemen of the American Congress, you are awaiting instructions from this \$50,000,000 annual river congress, that supports no project, but a barrel.

COL. FOX GIVES CONGRESS ITS INSTRUCTIONS.

In the same proceedings Special Director Col. John A. Fox took part. Col. Fox is the publicity agent, mentioned in my remarks of June 19, and the man who compelled the railroads

to give down. He has also been active in trying to get Mr. Rockefeller interested during a search for funds, as I will later show.

Col. Fox, with commendable modesty, tells what he intends the Congress of the United States shall do. He sees our duty, and with the aid of his "second congress" will look after its performance. He says in the 1911 report:

Gentlemen, we must not simply meet here and pass resolutions, adjourn, and go home, but we must see to it that the Congressman from every district in the United States understands the problem from a national viewpoint, sees it not from his local district's point of view, but from the point of view of a great national problem. We will see to it that he votes that the \$40,000,000 or \$50,000,000 that are needed every year toward completing this great work shall be appropriated.

#### SECRETARY ELLISON'S LEGISLATIVE STANDARDS.

A speech by a third officer of this second congress, delivered on the same occasion, is of special interest. We will again meet Capt. Ellison, the secretary and treasurer of the Rivers and Harbors Congress, but he has given the Members of the Federal Congress a new freedom of action, governed only by ability to get each one's share of loot. It is a novel amendment to the oath of office to which Congressmen subscribe. Mr. Ellison says in his annual speech:

I want to repeat and to emphasize that in supporting the National Rivers and Harbors Congress you are supporting your own cause. Another thing, be big and broad enough to demand that the improvements which are well underway, whether or not they happen to be your own particular projects, shall be put under the continuing-contract system and be taken off the appropriation map. The sooner that is done the sooner your own will receive its just recognition. Mark you, it is not my intention to criticize either Congress or Congressmen for lack of business methods, for I truly believe the average man who comes to Washington is just as good a business man as the average man he has left at home. It is not his fault, as I see it, but our fault, and I use the word "our" in a nation-wide sense. We send him here to legislate for the Nation, theoretically, but actually to get all he can for us; and if he does not get our share, and then some, we do our best to replace him with some other man, who will take better care of our particular congressional district.

What think you, gentlemen of the Sixty-third Congress, of these standards of legislative ethics to which the second congress subscribes through the pronouncements of its officers? Get all you can from the Federal Treasury, for by the amount of boodle you bring home will you be known. If you do not get your share of the annual \$50,000,000 loot, then you will be replaced, because twentieth century legislative morals have radically changed from those promulgated by the founders of the Federal Constitution.

#### PROJECTS DISTRIBUTED ACCORDING TO CONTRIBUTIONS.

One of the cardinal principles of this Rivers and Harbors Congress is that "nothing given, nothing got." By paying 1 per cent of Federal appropriations to the support of the Rivers and Harbors Congress every community can feel it has the supporting arm of Mr. Fox, Mr. Ellison, Mr. Thompson, Mr. Davenny, and other officials of this second congress. On pages 60 to 62 of the 1911 report appears a list of appropriations given to the different States of the Union amounting, in all, to \$178,616,897 from 1907 to 1911, inclusive.

In two columns the members of the second congress are impressed with the relation between that body and the amount of Government appropriations for each separate State. I quote literally from the listed method of comparison and cite a dozen States or more to show the proportionate grabs that are held out invitingly to gaze by the Rivers and Harbors Congress officials.

	Amounts subscribed to the support of National Rivers and Harbors Congress, by States, 1906-1911, inclusive.	Amount of appropriations received by States, in rivers and harbors bill, 1907-1911, inclusive.
Pennsylvania (east).....	\$4,295	\$4,837,745
Connecticut.....	2,115	2,318,000
Massachusetts.....	2,850	1,451,733
Maryland.....	1,755	2,778,265
New Jersey.....	2,735	3,484,895
North Carolina.....	2,538	2,259,614
South Carolina.....	1,137	1,237,290
Virginia.....	4,306	4,082,454
Georgia.....	8,281	4,102,889
Florida.....	1,620	5,183,670
District of Columbia.....	1,530	1,243,000
Alabama.....	6,090	6,952,000
Louisiana.....	9,505	3,820,292
Texas.....	8,825	9,193,309
Mississippi River.....		21,842,775

Mississippi River (1914), \$10,500,000, or nearly one-half of the six years' total.

#### DISTRIBUTING THE PORK.

New York and Florida receive more than the average State, excepting that the Mississippi River lump sum would swell the adjacent States over \$21,000,000, if counted. Florida has many small waterways, like the Kissimmee and the Oklawaha, and is the home of influential Members at both ends of the Capitol, who determine the fortunes of the annual river and harbor bill.

Doubtless it appeals to lay members to realize that by the investment of \$1 in the second congress \$100 will be forthcoming from the Federal Congress. It is in harmony with the views of Secretary Ellison and of the purposes set forth so eloquently by the constitution.

To become entitled to the generous Federal appropriations I have presented as a harvest for a 1 per cent investment, the following rates for annual dues are provided for membership in the "National Rivers and Harbors Congress of the United States," as it is styled by its officers:

	Annual dues.
Individuals.....	\$5
Firms or corporations.....	10
Organizations of less than 400.....	25
Organizations over 400 and less than 600.....	50
Organizations of 600 to 1,000.....	75
Organizations of 1,000 or more.....	100
Waterway associations.....	100

A system of graduated contributions for which graduated appropriations are in effect assured.

The report contains many interesting items, among which is Mr. Ellison's treasurer statement to members that receipts by him for the second congress from December 1, 1910, to November 30, 1911, coming from 171 cities, amounted to \$34,756.25. As this modest amount does not correspond with other statements in my hands, I believe it will serve a laudable purpose for me to insert in the record some contributions made to this remarkable organization from among the thousands of individuals living in the 171 cities. Just how this money is being expended is not disclosed, but a few discrepancies in amounts will be referred to, and in some of the cases I hold in my hands what purports to be original subscription lists, from which I will quote.

I next introduce a letter which may throw an interesting light upon contributions and be of service to contributors who meet Mr. Williams in his future travels.

WATERWAYS AND COMMERCE,  
No. 150 Nassau Street.

Hon. JAMES A. FREAR, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN FREAR:

I inclose herewith original subscription lists obtained from a canvasser named John M. Williams, of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, who received 50 per cent for the amount set opposite each name. As you will see, these subscriptions cover 1908, 1909, 1910, 1911, and 1912.

You may regard them as your property to do as you please with them.

Sincerely, yours,

RICHARD M. McCANN, Publisher.

I have knowledge of the information on which the foregoing statement is made, and believe it is correct as stated.

This certificate is introduced because it relates to the fortunes of Mr. Williams, whose activities will be briefly followed in connection with the Rivers and Harbors Congress and other waterway organizations:

STATE OF OHIO, EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,  
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,  
Columbus, November 26, 1909.

Mr. JOHN M. WILLIAMS,  
Pittsburgh, Pa.

MY DEAR SIR: I have the honor to appoint you as one of the delegates from Ohio to attend the coming session of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress at Washington, D. C., December 8-10, 1909.

You are advised that there is no fund out of which the expenses of the delegates to this congress can be paid, but I feel that your interest in the purposes of the congress is such as to lead you to attend, if it is possible for you to do so.

Respectfully,

[SEAL.]

JUDSON HARMON, Governor.

BALTIMORE'S CONTRIBUTIONS TO A CONGRESS.

As I am unable to secure a congressional investigation of the activities of the Rivers and Harbors Congress, I have digressed long enough to call attention to a copy of the proceedings of the eighth annual convention of the "congress second only in importance to the Congress of the United States," held at Washington December 6, 7, and 8, 1911. On pages 51 to 54 are given the total receipts from 171 cities from December 1, 1910, to November 30, 1911, inclusive, amounting to \$34,756.25, as previously stated.

Referring to the total contributions received from Maryland during this period we find, on page 53, that Baltimore contributes \$25 and Pocomoke City \$5; total, \$30.

This is the published statement given to the members of the Rivers and Harbors Congress, but I have in my hands what



purports to be some original subscription lists, and it is significant that Mr. Furst's dredging company's subscription of \$100 and others noted fail to appear in the statement submitted for 1911, although Pocomoke City, that eventually will receive a share of pork for its \$5 offering, gets into print with its widow's mite.

#### BALTIMORE IS FIRST AMONG THE NEEDY.

Here follows a special plea for the Atlantic coast canal system, which at once must be improved. The plea reached the pocketbooks of dredgers, contractors, and others, as hereafter appears, following this pointed letter of introduction.

[National Rivers and Harbors Congress: JOSEPH E. RANDELL, president, Washington, D. C., and Lake Providence, La.; J. F. Ellison, secretary and treasurer, Cincinnati, Ohio; John A. Fox, special director, Washington, D. C.]

WASHINGTON OFFICE, 1910.

To the business interests of Baltimore, Md.:

The National Rivers and Harbors Congress is working earnestly to secure the adoption by the Federal Government of a permanent waterway policy that will provide for improving all the worthy waterways of the Union.

The improvement of the canals and waters of the Atlantic coast, in which Baltimore has such a direct and vital interest, should be among the first to receive the benefit of the increased and regular appropriations for rivers and harbors that this organization is working to bring about.

Funds are needed to carry on the work which the National Rivers and Harbors Congress has persistently urged, and to the end that a strong demand may come from every section of the Republic we earnestly invite your financial cooperation.

John M. Williams is authorized to receive and receipt for all moneys that may be subscribed. He is working under the direction of and reporting to the undersigned officers of the congress.

Very respectfully,

JOS. E. RANDELL,  
President.

P. S.—We earnestly urge the people of Baltimore to contribute to the support of this great work.

DAVID H. CARROLL,  
Vice President.  
JOHN R. SHERWOOD,  
Director.

The foregoing presents our old friend, Mr. Williams, of 50 per cent collection-terms fame. That he was industrious the following statement shows.

Attached to the letter is the following evidence of appreciation:

#### Baltimore subscribers to the National Rivers and Harbors Congress.

Baltimore Steam Packet Co.	\$50
David H. Carroll (paid)	50
Maryland Steel Co.	50
Chesapeake Steamship Co.	50
U. S. Fidelity & Guaranty Co.	25
J. H. Whaley (paid)	50
Baltimore, Chesapeake & Atlantic Railway Co.	50
Chas. C. Fulton & Co. (Baltimore American)	50
Emmon Drug Co., per J. Hinder (paid)	25
James A. Gary (paid)	25
William B. Hurst	25
Walter Anker, superintendent of Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co.	50
The Red Oil Manufacturing Co.	25
The Crown Cork & Seal Co.	25
Woodward & Balwin Co. (paid)	50
The Deford Co. (paid)	25
Baltimore & Steamboat Co.	25
Duke, Peterson Hardware Co. (paid)	10
Old Town National Bank, Baltimore, Md., by John W. Hook, president (paid)	10
A. Schumacher (paid)	10
William E. Woodalls & Co. (paid)	10
The A. S. Abell Co. (Baltimore Sun)	50
Baker-Whiteley Coal Co. (paid)	10
Walter Anker, Baltimore & Ohio Building, expires Feb. 4, 1911	5
Atlantic Transport Co., J. C. Gorman, manager, expires Dec. 5, 1908	50
Baltimore Steam Packet Co., John R. Sherwood, president:	
Expires 1908	50
Expires Feb. 4, 1910	10
Baltimore Chamber of Commerce, H. A. Wroth, secretary:	
Expires 1909	25
Expires July 10, 1910	25
W. B. Brooks, president Sanford & Brooks Co., 24 Commerce street, expires Feb. 1, 1910	5
Baltimore & Chesapeake Railway Co., Thompson G. Williams, vice president and general manager, expires Dec. 5, 1908	50
Chesapeake Steamship Co., Key Compton, president, expires Jan. 31, 1911	10
Consolidated Coal Co., J. H. Wheelwright, vice president, expires Dec. 5, 1908	50
Reuben Foster, 2301 North Charles Street, expires Dec. 5, 1908	100
Jacob W. Hook, Old Town National Bank, expires Jan. 24, 1911	5
Merchants & Manufacturers' Association, Thos. G. Boggs, secretary, expires Feb. 11, 1909, 1910, 1911	25
Maryland Dredging & Contracting Co., F. A. Furst, president, 803 Fidelity Building:	
Expires 1908	100
Expires Jan. 24, 1911	10
Merchants & Miners' Transportation Co., J. C. Whitney, president, expires Dec. 5, 1908	100
Manufacturers' Record Publishing Co., R. H. Edmonds, president, expires Jan. 5, 1907	10

John G. Ruge, care of Ruge Bros. Canning Co., 607 American Building, expires Nov. 27, 1909 5 || Sanford & Brooks Co., expires Dec. 5, 1908 | 50 |
| Tolchester Co., William C. Ellason, president, expires Dec. 5, 1908 | 25 |

#### TWO CONGRESSES SHAKE HANDS.

A further list of subscribers shows that Mr. Furst, president of the Dredge Owners' Protective Organization, is not wholly unmindful of the services rendered his organization by the Rivers and Harbors Congress.

The Dredge Owners' Protective Organization confidentially assists. Witness the following:

[Dredge Owners' Protective Organization: Frank A. Furst, chairman. William P. Ryan, secretary. Executive committee: F. A. Furst, George Leary, John Gerrish, J. McMullen, P. Sanford Ross, W. J. Bradley.]

BALTIMORE, MD., August 4, 1910.

Mr. JOHN M. WILLIAMS, General Agent,  
National Rivers and Harbors Congress, New York City.

DEAR SIR: I find yours of the 1st instant awaiting my return to the city this morning.

Replying to your inquiry, I am submitting below a list of our members for your confidential use, as follows:

Morris & Cumings Dredging Co., 17 State Street, New York.  
Eastern Dredging Co., 247 Atlantic Avenue, Boston, Mass.  
Newark Meadows Improvement Co., 62 Cedar Street, New York.  
American Dredging Co., Mariner & Merchants Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

W. H. Beard Co., 21 State Street, New York.  
International Contracting Co., 17 State Street, New York.  
Atlantic Gulf & Pacific Co., Park Row Building, New York City.  
P. S. Ross (Inc.), 277 Washington Street, Jersey City, N. J.  
Hy Steers (Inc.), 17 Battery Place, New York.  
North American Dredging Co., San Francisco.  
American Dredging Co., San Francisco.  
Sanford & Brooks Co., Baltimore.  
Coastwise Dredging Co., Bank of Commerce Building, Norfolk.  
Norfolk Dredging Co., 217 Water Street, Norfolk.  
Bowers Southern Dredging Co., Galveston.  
Breyman Bros., East Boston, Mass.  
J. S. Packard Co., 31 Market Square, Providence, R. I.  
Daly & Hannan Dredging Co., Ogdensburg, N. Y.  
Bay State Dredging Co., 185 Summer Street, Boston, Mass.  
R. Moore, Mobile, Ala.

Yours, very respectfully,

W. P. RYAN, Secretary.

Here is the confidential collector of the congress receiving a confidential list of the Dredgers' Association from its secretary for the purposes of securing funds from the dredgers to aid the River Congress in putting through an annual pork barrel for Baltimore projects and for other localities.

These look like encouraging prospects, but no statement discloses their purpose in the statement before me:

Key Compton, president Chesapeake Steamship Co., Pier 19, Light Street Wharf.  
Capt. W. C. Ellason, president Tolchester Co., Pier 16, Light Street Wharf.  
Capt. Willard Thomson, vice president and general manager Baltimore, Chesapeake & Atlantic Railway, Pier No. 1, Pratt Street.  
Clarence Shriver, agent, Ericsson Line, Pratt and Light Streets (second floor).  
John C. Whitney, president Merchants & Miners Transportation Co., Light and German Streets.  
Harry G. Skinner, president Skinner Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., Locust Point.  
William E. Woodall & Co., South Side of Basin.  
James C. Gorman, agent Atlantic Transport Co., No. 201 Chamber of Commerce Building.  
Robert Ransay Co., No. 705 Keyser Building.  
A. Schumacher & Co., agents North German Lloyd Co., Gay near Baltimore Street.  
Dresel Rauschenberg & Co., No. 319 Chamber of Commerce Building.  
Winfield S. Cahill & Co., South Side of Basin.  
Mason L. Williams, Baltimore & Carolina Steamship Co., No. 604 Union Trust Building.  
W. E. Slaughter, Eastern Shore Steamboat Co., Pier 5, Pratt Street.  
John C. Bosley, manager Steamer Dreamland, Browns Wharf.  
F. W. Wood, president Maryland Steel Co., Sparrows Point, Md.  
Wallace Stebbins (Cons.), Charles and Lombard Streets.  
Walter Anker, superintendent floating equipment, Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, Baltimore and Charles Streets.  
O. F. Lackey, engineer, Harbor Board, City Hall, Baltimore.  
John W. Hook, president Old Town Bank, Gay and Exeter Streets.  
George C. Thomas, No. 529 Law Building.  
William B. Hurst, care John E. Hurst & Co., Hopkins Place and Lombard Street.  
William H. Fehsenfeld, president Red "C" Oil Co., 111 Cheapside.  
Thornton Rollins, president Maryland National Bank, Continental Trust Building.  
Capt. R. M. Spedden, Third National Bank, Baltimore and North Streets.  
Mr. J. R. Bland, president United States Fidelity and Guaranty Co., Calvert and German Streets.  
Reuben Foster, No. 920 Equitable Building.  
B. N. Baker, No. 903 Calvert Building.  
Emmerson Drug Co. (Jos. Hends).  
Crom Cork Co.

#### DELAWARE RIVER IS ALSO FIRST AMONG THE NEEDY.

Here follows the pressing need of the Delaware River, which must have an appropriation at once, according to the Rivers and Harbors Congress. This brought a generous subscription from all ports on the Delaware, including something substantial from Philadelphia.

The letter reads:

[National Rivers and Harbors Congress, second in importance only to the Congress of the United States: JOSEPH E. RANDELL, president, Washington, D. C., and Lake Providence, La.; J. F. ELLISON, secretary and treasurer, Cincinnati, Ohio; John A. Fox, special director, Washington, D. C.]

WASHINGTON OFFICE, 1910.

To the business interests of Wilmington, Del.:

The National Rivers and Harbors Congress is working earnestly to secure the adoption by the Federal Government of a permanent waterway policy that will provide for improving all the worthy waterways of the Union.

The deepening of the Delaware River and the improvement of the canals and waterways of the Atlantic coast, in which Wilmington has such a direct and vital interest, should be among the first to receive the benefit of the increased and regular appropriations for rivers and harbors that this organization is working to bring about.

Funds are needed to carry on the work which the National Rivers and Harbors Congress has persistently urged, and to the end that a strong demand may come from every section of the Republic your financial cooperation is invited.

Very respectfully,

ANTHONY HIGGINS,

Delaware Director of National Congress of Rivers and Harbors.

The bearer of this letter, Mr. Williams, has been properly introduced, and it is desirable that those interested in improvement of the waterways by the National Government should contribute to this propaganda, and I urge upon all to do so as liberally as they can.

HORAN WILSON,  
Vice President for Delaware.

It may be well not to overlook the fact that this recommendation is given to our old friend, Mr. Williams, who is alleged to have received 50 per cent of collections in other cases and who is aiding "this propaganda" to the best of his ability. A list of a few Philadelphia subscriptions follow. It is significant that it includes varied interests from transportation companies that are understood to favor the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal down to the Sugar Trust.

Philadelphia subscribers to the National Rivers and Harbors Congress.

Geo. E. Bartol, No. 220 the Bourse, Feb. 7, 1910	\$50
E. W. Clark & Co., Feb. 10, 1910	100
E. Wm. Fry, Feb. 14, 1910	50
Crow Leitch & Co.	25
J. W. Pew	100
Edward F. Henson & Co.	25
Baltimore-Philadelphia Steamboat Co.	25
H. D. Woodson	25
J. J. Mohs & Sons	25
O. G. Stemplead & Sons	25
E. E. Waite Sons	25
Chas. Gring	25
Wm. S. McGram	10
F. W. Munn	25
Earn-Line Steamship Co.	50
Justice, Bateman & Co.	25
Henry Disston & Sons (Inc.)	100
The Philadelphia Transportation & Lighting Co.	25
Pure Oil Co.	50
The Wm. J. McCahan Sugar Refining Co.	50
Union Petroleum Co., by A. C. Woodman	50
Independent Pier Co., by C. Nyle	50
Wm. Sellers & Co., Inc., by Coleman Tellers, president	20
Kline & French Co.	25
Wm. J. Thompson	20
T. B. Rice & Sons Co., by W. L. Rice	25
Hampton Dunn	50
John T. Bailey Co.	25
John B. Stetson Co.	25
T. S. Westanell	50
John L. Vandier	25
Geo. Baunlamp	25
M. C. Hansman	10
Slevenwennr Busche	10
Morris, Wheeler & Co.	25
Garrett-Buchanan Co., by J. S. Siners, president	20
E. J. Lavino & Co.	20
Philip Godley	10
Stephen F. Whitman & Son	20
M. L. Dupee & Co.	25
Merchant & Evans Co., by J. M. Macke, treasurer (paid)	20
Wm. H. Horstmann Co., by Walter Hortsman (paid)	25
Alan Wood, Iron & Steel Co., by J. R. Iser, treasurer (paid)	25
Whitall Tatum Co., by R. O. Nickolson, general manager	20

THE OHIO RIVER IS ALSO FIRST AMONG THE NEEDY.

Here is a declaration that the Ohio stands at the head and must at once be improved. The Rivers and Harbors Congress gets a generous offering through the instrumentality of Mr. Williams, who is again to the rescue.

ADVOCATES A POLICY, NOT A PROJECT.

[National Rivers and Harbors Congress: JOSEPH E. RANDELL, president, Washington, D. C., and Lake Providence, La.; J. F. ELLISON, secretary and treasurer, Cincinnati, Ohio; John A. Fox, special director, Washington, D. C.]

CINCINNATI, OHIO, September, 1909.

To the business interests of Pittsburgh, Pa.:

The National Rivers and Harbors Congress in its work to secure legislation that will result in the adoption and putting into effect by the Federal Government of a permanent policy that will provide funds for the improvement of the waterways of the Nation, the worth of which has been demonstrated, solicits financial cooperation; this is necessary in order that the campaign of arousing throughout all parts of the United States a demand for such a policy may be carried on systematically and uninterruptedly.

The improvement of the Ohio River, which most directly concerns the commercial interests of Pittsburgh, now admittedly stands at the head

of all rivers. It has been so placed by the United States Engineer Corps, working to bring about and will be the first to benefit from such appropriations.

The general agent of the organization, John M. Williams, is authorized to receive and receipt for all moneys that may be subscribed. He is working under the direction of and reporting to the undersigned officers of the congress.

Very respectfully, yours,

JOS. E. RANDELL, President.

J. F. ELLISON,

Secretary and Treasurer.

I most heartily indorse the above appeal and sincerely hope that in view of the great benefit to our city to be derived from the improvement of the Ohio River that our people will cheerfully contribute toward the expense involved in carrying on the work of this organization.

WM. B. RODGERS, Director.

It is hardly possible that any casual reader will overlook the fact that Mr. Williams, of 50 per cent collection fame, is now working on other prospects. Also we meet with our old friend Capt. Ellison.

Pittsburgh subscribers to the National Rivers and Harbors Congress.

James Rees & Sons Co., by Thos. M. Rees (paid)	\$250
John H. Jones	250
H. K. Korter Co., by H. K. Korter, jr. (paid)	100
Midland Steel Co., by William C. Fownes, jr., secretary (paid)	100
Standard Sanitary Manufacturing Co., per W. A. Myher, secretary (paid)	100
United Engineering & Foundry Co., by Isaac W. Frank (paid)	100
Colonial Steel Co. (paid)	100
E. H. Jennings Bros. Co. (paid)	100
Thomas A. Jenkins	50
Standard Underground Cable Co., J. W. Marsh, president (paid)	100
Ritter-Conley Manufacturing Co.	100
Joseph Horne Co. (paid)	100
H. D. W. English	25
The Natural Gas Co. of West Virginia, by George Heard (paid)	25
L. V. Thompson (paid)	100
Rogers Sand Co., by J. W. Rogers	250
The T. A. Gillespie Co., by W. H. Wanveck, secretary	100
Pittsburgh Steel Co., by W. H. Rowe (paid)	100
Dilworth, Porters Co. (paid)	100
Iron City Sand Co. (paid)	50
Arbuthnot-Stephenson Co., by W. S. Arbuthnot (paid)	100
Clyde Coal Co., by James G. Geeger (paid)	100
The A. R. Budd Coal Co., by A. R. Budd (paid)	100
Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co., by C. B. Brown (paid)	100
The Pittsburgh Dry Goods Co. (paid)	100
United States Glass Co., by J. S. Knox (paid)	100
Wilson-Snyder Manufacturing Co. (paid)	100
J. K. Davidson & Bros. (paid)	100
National Tube Co., by John D. Culbertson (paid)	250
H. J. Heinz Co. (paid)	200
Armstrong Cork Co. (paid)	100
The May Drug Co. (paid)	25
Follansbee Bros. Co. (paid)	100
Kier Fire Brick Co. (paid)	25
Rosenbaum Co. (paid)	25
Pittsburgh Brewing Co. (paid)	50
Mutual Union Brewing Co. (paid)	25
Oil Well Supply Co., John Eaton, president (paid)	100
Frick & Lindsay Co. (paid)	25
Zug Iron & Steel Co. (paid)	50
J. N. Pew	50

Again we find Pennsylvania generously contributing to the Rivers and Harbors Congress, and across the Alleghenies we find the Steel Trust reaching hands with the Sugar Trust; but the most interesting phase of the foregoing subscription list lies in the fact that while the total reaches \$4,025, and presumably does not include all Pittsburgh contributions, the report of the treasurer of the Rivers and Harbors Congress, Mr. Ellison, of good advice, for the following year, mentions only \$105 from Pittsburgh. I hold other subscription lists from Pittsburgh, which prove that the business concerns there are generous contributors. What the members of the Rivers and Harbors Congress and the public generally will desire to know is whether or not Mr. Williams increased his commission from 50 per cent to 95 per cent of the collections when visiting the Smoky City. If more was collected, how has it been accounted for? A congressional investigation would explain this apparent discrepancy of 95 per cent in collections within one year, and also the Baltimore collections and other discrepancies, that indicate much larger contributions than appear from the report of Secretary Ellison.

NEW JERSEY'S CONTRIBUTORS.

Again referring to the report of the treasurer of the Rivers and Harbors Congress for 1911, it appears that \$120 is contributed by Newark to keep the ship of the Rivers and Harbors Congress on an even keel. Without analyzing the following subscription list, it is apparent that New Jersey has been a generous and a frequent contributor in the effort to secure its share of \$50,000,000 in annual appropriations for the river and harbor bills regularly confronting Congress, war tax or no war tax.

Contributors to National Rivers and Harbors Congress of New Jersey.

N. J. Adamant Manufacturing Co., Harrison; expired Feb. 7, 1908	\$10
Atlantic City Bureau of Information and Publicity, George S. Lenhart, director, Pacific and Tennessee Avenues, Atlantic City; expired Dec. 7, 1909	5
A. B. Ayers, 358 Ogden Street, Newark; expired May 7, 1908	25



Dr. M. R. Brinkman, Hackensack; expires 1911.	\$5
A. T. Bell, secretary the Leads Co., Chalfonte, Atlantic City; expired May 9, 1909.	5
P. Ballantine & Sons, Newark; expired Feb. 12, 1911.	10
Balback Smelting & Refining Co., Newark; expired Apr. 25, 1908.	100
E. P. Backus Lumber Co., Newark; expired May 27, 1908.	25
George Brown & Co., Gilbert C. Brown, president, Newark; expired Apr. 20, 1908.	50
John J. Cone, 532 Bergen Avenue, Jersey City; expired June 22, 1911.	5
Columbia Insurance Co., Jersey City; expired Feb. 12, 1914.	10
Cawley Clark Co., 278 Passaic Street, Newark; expired Feb. 7, 1908.	10
James Cromwell, Fort Cross Street, Newark; expired Feb. 7, 1908.	5
Clark Thread Co., post office box 154, Newark; expired Feb. 7, 1908.	10
Clark Mille End Steamship Co., Newark; expired Feb. 7, 1908.	10
Cook & Genung Co., Newark; expired May 9, 1908.	25
Frederick W. Donnelly, Opera House Store, Newark; expired Jan. 26, 1911.	5
Elizabeth Board of Trade, William F. Groves, secretary, Elizabeth; expired Sept. 21, 1914.	25
Eastwood Wire Manufacturing Co., John H. Eastwood, treasurer, Belleville; expired Apr. 20, 1908.	50
Edmund C. Hill, 7 West State Street, Trenton; expired Feb. 3, 1910.	5
Edward H. Horwood, Hoboken Board of Trade, Hoboken; expired Feb. 4, 1910.	5
Headley & Farmer Co., Newark; expired Feb. 7, 1908.	10
David Harper, Harrison; expired Feb. 7, 1908.	5
James S. Higbie, James R. Syer, jr., & Co., Newark; expired Feb. 10, 1911.	5
Hoboken Board of Trade, by the secretary, Hoboken; expired July 22, 1908.	25
William A. Jones & Son, Newark; expired Feb. 7, 1908.	10
Listers Agriculture Chemical Works, Newark; expired Feb. 12, 1911.	10
Marshall & Co., Newark; expired Apr. 19, 1908.	50
The Nairn Linoleum Co., Kearney; expired Feb. 7, 1911.	10
Passaic River Protection Association, by secretary, Newark; expired Mar. 27, 1907.	25
Mitchell B. Perkins, Beverly; expired Jan. 24, 1911.	5
W. H. Quigley, Coopers Point, Camden; expired Jan. 1, 1909.	5
George F. Reeves, 88 Front Street, Newark; expired May 23, 1911.	5
Standard Oil Co., post-office box 278, Newark; expired Feb. 19, 1911.	10
Peter Shields, Cape May; expired Jan. 11, 1911.	5
The Trenton-Philadelphia Deeper Waterways Association, by secretary, Trenton; expired June 14, 1911.	100
Trenton Chamber of Commerce, by secretary, Trenton; expired Nov. 18, 1910.	25
Ambrose Tomkins, 74 Passaic Street, Newark; expired Feb. 20, 1908.	10
Tomkins Bros., 74 Passaic Street, Newark; expired Feb. 7, 1908.	10
Van Kuren & Sons, Harrison; expired Apr. 20, 1908.	25
Walsh & Sons Co., Newark; expired Feb. 7, 1908.	10
S. T. Zabriskie, president the Anderson Lumber Co., Passaic; expired Dec. 7, 1909.	5
Acme Rubber Co., Trenton, expires Oct. 21, 1912.	25
George Brown & Co., Newark, expires Apr. 25, 1912.	25
Cook & Genung Co., Newark, expires Apr. 25, 1912.	25
Cawley-Clark Co., Newark, expires Apr. 26, 1912.	15
Cook's Linoleum Co., Trenton, expires Sept. 25, 1912.	50
H. W. Dunn, Trenton, expires May 6, 1913.	5
Eureka Flint & Spar Co., Trenton, expires Oct. 16, 1912.	25
Golding Sons' Co., Trenton, expires Oct. 17, 1912.	25
C. T. Hilderbrecht, Trenton, expires Oct. 21, 1912.	5
Samuel Heath Co., Trenton, expires Oct. 20, 1912.	10
James S. Higbie, Newark, expires Mar. 20, 1912.	5
S. E. Kauffman, Trenton, expires Nov. 1, 1912.	10
A. K. Lueckel & Co., Trenton, expires Nov. 1, 1912.	10
Listers' Agriculture Chemical Works, Newark, expires Oct. 27, 1912.	25
E. W. McClave & Son (Inc.), Harrison, expires Apr. 26, 1912.	25
Richard Morrell, Passaic, expires Jan. 25, 1913.	5
Monument Pottery Co., Trenton, expires Nov. 30, 1912.	25
Thos. Maddock, Sons & Co., Trenton, expires Oct. 10, 1912.	50
J. L. Mott Co., Trenton, expires Sept. 21, 1912.	50
Henry G. Parker, New Brunswick, expires Oct. 10, 1912.	10
Princeton Worsteds Mills, Trenton, expires Oct. 10, 1912.	25
People's Brewing Co., Trenton, expires Oct. 10, 1912.	50
Horace G. Reeder, Trenton, expires Jan. 17, 1913.	5

Senator KENTON's list of 1910 subscriptions from New Jersey is also of interest. I presented it in connection with his remarks.

#### COL. FOX AND MR. ROCKEFELLER.

How much did Col. Fox collect from John D. Rockefeller?

Col. John Fox is the leading publicity agent for the lower Mississippi River and for the River and Harbor Congress. In my remarks contained in the RECORD for June 19 last, I gave some special notice to the extended operations of Col. Fox among newspapers and magazines while engaged in his labors directing public sentiment. Without question he has successfully kept his waterway proposition in the public eye for several years, and frequent expressions of universal concern over lower Mississippi floods were usually inspired by Col. Fox, publicity agent, for his great land-reclamation scheme. If further data than that already furnished are desired, an investigation will disclose the facts.

Col. Fox has been the head and shoulders of waterway activities, even to the extent of showing Congressmen what to do and when and where to do it. As he modestly stated before the association which he so cleverly pilots:

We will see to it that he (the Congressman) votes that the \$40,000,000 or \$50,000,000 that are needed every year toward completing this great work shall be appropriated.

During the recent fight in the Senate to defeat the pork barrel, Col. Fox, the congressional guardian, occupied a front seat in the Senators' private gallery, pulling for the bill. And Col. Fox's pull should not be ignored.

I presented to the House on a former occasion what purports to be a photographic copy of subscription lists secured by Mr. Fox for the lower Mississippi River reclamation project, which reached the neat sum of \$150,000, according to his statement, in annual contributions.

It included liberal subscriptions from many railroads, the Harvester Trust, and other large interests which presumably have holdings in lands that are to be redeemed or reclaimed at the expense of the National Government. I will refer to that list again.

#### A FAMOUS NEW YORK LUNCHEON.

How much did Col. Fox, special field director of the Rivers and Harbors Congress, receive from John D. Rockefeller? That he solicited funds I am sure Mr. Gates, Mr. Rockefeller's representative, will admit, and the records ought to show how much. How much did Col. Fox raise in New York, where he and Col. Stevens, also an agent of the Rivers and Harbors Congress, gave a notable luncheon at the Mechanics' Club, New York City, in 1910? Hon. Nathan Straus, Mr. Havemeyer, John Hays Hammond, C. M. Schwab, and a number of other distinguished citizens were among the invited guests. These guests are among New York's leading men. Some of them are noted for public spirit and great wealth. How much did Mr. Fox collect from these gentlemen, and what became of the funds? How much was employed in pushing the back-fire against Senators while Special Field Director Fox, from his seat in the Senate gallery, like a field marshal of old, watched his commander, the president of the congress, marshaling his hosts in battle array.

We have learned that the congress received contributions from the Steel Trust at Pittsburgh and from the Standard Oil Trust at New York and from the Harvester Trust at New Orleans. Philadelphia also gave a small contribution from the Sugar Trust. But how much came from the great organizers of trusts, Mr. Rockefeller and Mr. Havemeyer, as well as from the distinguished guests who were invited to meet Col. Fox at that luncheon?

#### EATING HIS WAY INTO PLUTOCRACY.

I feel sure Col. Fox will not deny the Rockefeller incident nor the luncheon, because I have examined what I believe to be interesting original correspondence on the subject. It sustains the belief that if Col. Fox was on the 50 per cent commission list for his congress collections, he wasted no time in getting to the fountainhead of individual wealth with that same alacrity evidenced when he annually lands on the Federal Treasury for \$50,000,000.

How much did he raise in New York, from whom, and how was it spent? Is it a matter of record? If so, where?

In view of the fruitful offerings from railroads and other sources that greeted Col. Fox's efforts elsewhere, a waiting public and even the River and Harbor Congress would be interested in knowing how much was raised through that luncheon; and how was it expended? We must not forget that the dredgers' secret report recommended feeding Members of Congress at banquets. The Ohio Valley Society is shown to have expended some \$1,500 for the same general purpose on one occasion. Money was contributed by the Central Life Insurance Co. and hundreds of other subscribers along the Ohio River.

With this object lesson in waterway improvement and land reclamation before him, Col. Fox undoubtedly attempted to reach his distinguished New York guests through their gastronomical organs. How well he succeeded will be disclosed by an investigation.

That the score or more of waterway associations, aside from the Rivers and Harbors Congress, are all giving active aggressive support to the passage of every rivers and harbors bill may be generally understood, but the amounts collected and the character of expenditures are not matters of general knowledge. Leaving for the time being the larger organization, that places a protecting wing over all other waterway associations and all projects, whether good, bad, or indifferent, when once incorporated into a \$50,000,000 annual pork barrel, I will offer two or three subscription lists which indicate that in efforts to persuade Congress that particular projects are of value thousands of dollars are handled annually by organizations that rank second to and are closely affiliated with the Rivers and Harbors Congress.

#### RAILROAD CONTRIBUTIONS.

On June 3, on pages 10591 to 10599 of the RECORD, appear my remarks before the House wherein I pointed out secret efforts to influence Congress on rivers and harbors bills from

subscriptions of money to the use of threats against business men. At that time I presented the following subscriptions, running for five years, taken from what purported to be a photographic copy of a typewritten statement made by Col. John A. Fox, secretary and manager of the Mississippi Levee Association:

It has been estimated that a minimum fund of \$30,000 per annum is necessary for this organization to do its work in a complete and thorough manner, and already a considerable portion of this sum has been pledged annually for five years (or \$150,000 in all). The subscriptions are as follows:

Southern Ry. Co.	\$1,000
Mobile & Ohio R. R. Co.	1,000
Frisco R. R. Co.	1,000
Missouri Pacific Ry. Co.	1,000
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Ry. Co.	1,000
St. Louis & Southwestern Ry. Co.	1,000
Illinois Central R. R. Co.	1,000
Yazoo & Mississippi Valley R. R. Co.	1,000
Chicago Mill & Lumber Co.	1,000
Caldwell & Smith, Memphis.	1,000
International Harvester Co.	1,000

Assurance has been given of other substantial amounts.

As I have before stated, on June 3 I called the attention of the House to contributions made by eight railways for the purpose of aiding in the passage of a river pork barrel. It will be remembered that contributions approximating \$150,000 for the five-year period were given in the Record, and it was further shown that \$40,000 of this amount was guaranteed by eight railroads for the purpose of influencing Congress to pass the bill. At that time I asked why an investigation was not had of this remarkable situation, and I further demanded in my resolution that all interests engaged in lobbying through such bills should be compelled to come out in the open.

A congressional investigation would be wonderfully enlightening in showing what other contributions reached the hands of Col. Fox, who is special director of the Rivers and Harbors Congress and an active publicity agent second to none in the country, as I have offered abundant testimony to prove.

#### CINCINNATI IS WIDE-AWAKE.

I hold what purports to be a detailed statement of the Cincinnati subscriptions for 1909 of the Ohio Valley Improvement Association, amounting to \$4,566.25. Capt. Ellison, the secretary of the association, was later secretary of the Rivers and Harbors Congress. I will not set forth at length the list, which reaches nearly 200 subscribers, nor do I question the right of these individuals to subscribe any amount desired to advance the Ohio River propaganda. The list includes the name of a distinguished brother of the then President of the United States, and of others interested in urging the Ohio River proposition in Congress. The Union Central Life Insurance Co., which, I believe, had mutualized before that year, was a contributor, according to the list, whether with or without the consent of policyholders does not appear. Contract companies, transportation companies, and even the United Commercial Travelers were persuaded to contribute.

The Business Men's Club put in \$100, and the next space is filled by an ice concern, in order to preserve an equable distribution of temperature throughout the list. Many banking interests joined in the propaganda, also brewing companies gave liberally, and everything that looked easy along the Ohio seems to have been solicited in the "On to Cairo" movement.

In view of the report made by the Commissioner of Corporations that all the terminals at Cairo and most of those at Cincinnati are owned by the railways, it is interesting to note that no railway subscriptions appear in this particular list.

The treasurer's statement to our friend Ellison follows:

QUEEN CITY SUPPLY CO.,  
Cincinnati, October 27, 1909.

Capt. J. F. ELLISON,  
Secretary Ohio Valley Improvement Association, City.

MY DEAR SIR: Referring to the recent convention in our city of the Ohio Valley Improvement Association, I submit, as treasurer, the following:

Subscriptions received, as per list herewith attached	\$4,566.25
Payments for entertainment and all other expenses, as per vouchers herewith attached	1,543.44
Leaving a balance of	3,022.81

For which please find check herewith. This check is in accordance with the understanding of the committee and the Ohio Valley Improvement Association.

Yours, truly,

GEO. PUCHTA.

MR. WILLIAMS IS BEARER OF A CONSTANT TOUCH.

Here follows a gem among a collector's jewels. It purports to be for Portsmouth, Ohio, for 1913, and introduces our old tried and true friend, Mr. John M. Williams, who is alleged to have a contract with the secretary of the Rivers and Harbors Congress for 50 per cent fee for certain collection.

It is not uninteresting to note that portion of the letter introducing Mr. Williams, which feelingly declares:

We must be in constant touch with the Rivers and Harbors Committee while Congress is in session and this can only be done through the presence of our president in Washington.

From which it appears no "touch" is overlooked. What more eloquent plea for funds can be imagined than the following:

Unless the business interests continue their support other more active and progressive sections of the country clamoring for similar appropriations will crowd us out. Such a result would be not only humiliating but most deplorable from every point of view.

Remembering that in the two 1914 bills, the sundry civil and the regular pork barrel, a total of some \$9,176,000 was set apart for the Ohio, it does not look very humiliating in amount compared with Chicago, which carries at its two ports practically the same tonnage as the entire Ohio River, according to Government reports, and gets about one hundredth part of the amount given to the Ohio.

The 1913 touch overlooked no small towns. The letter follows:

"ON TO CAIRO."

OHIO VALLEY IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATION,  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY, CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,  
Portsmouth, Ohio, 1913.

To the business interests:

A widespread feeling that the Ohio River improvement is positively assured and that no further occasion for attention to the matter exists is now the greatest barrier against its early completion.

What has been accomplished is the definite adoption of the project by Congress, and annual instead of triennial appropriations have been secured. But the appropriations are not large enough by far to complete the work within a reasonable time. To insure such completion the project must be put, in point of appropriations, on the Panama Canal basis, so that the work may be prosecuted on a large scale all along the line.

Nothing short of manifestations of public interest and constant planning and agitation on the part of the Ohio Valley Improvement Association will accomplish this. We must be in constant touch with the Rivers and Harbors Committee while Congress is in session, and this can only be done through the presence of our president in Washington. In addition we must keep up the interest all along the river and throughout the Ohio Valley.

Unless the business interests continue their support, other more active and progressive sections of the country clamoring for similar appropriations will crowd us out. Such a result would be not only humiliating but most deplorable from every point of view.

We trust that this appeal will meet a financial response commensurate with the tremendous importance of the subject.

The bearer, John M. Williams, or H. M. Parsons are authorized to receive and receipt for all moneys subscribed.

Very respectfully, yours,

W. C. GULKINS, Secretary.

Approved and indorsed.

JOHN E. WILLIAMS, Vice President.

The Excelsior Shoe Co. (paid)	\$35
The Selby Shoe Co. (paid)	50
The Portsmouth Stove & Range Co. (paid)	25
The Peebles Paving Brick Co. (paid)	25
The Breece Manufacturing Co. (paid)	25
The Stockham Co., by J. M. Stockham (paid)	10
Ohio Stove Co., Robert G. Bryan, president (paid)	10
The Hibbs Hardware Co. (paid)	15
The Anderson Bros. Co. (paid)	10
The First National Bank (paid)	10
The Portsmouth Gas Co. (paid)	10
Allen Jordan (paid)	10
L. D. York (paid)	25
The River City Lumber Co. (paid)	10
L. A. Turley (paid)	10
The Joseph J. Reed Co. (paid)	10

For fear it may be assumed that this "On to Cairo" is a cheap movement, I offer a Pittsburgh list of subscribers. Other lists for other years contain similar names and amounts. Among the many collection lists I have scanned this one has some unusually interesting and instructive features. It introduces our old friend Mr. Williams, who is alleged to have a contract with the National Rivers and Harbors Congress for 50 per cent of certain collections. An investigation would determine the facts in view of the announcement that—

The records of the association for the past 12 years is a guaranty that all funds subscribed to the association will be devoted entirely and effectively to the work for which the association was formed, viz, the improvement of the Ohio River.

So Pittsburgh gets to work to land its share, and we find the Consolidated Coke & Coal Co. that controls most of the navigation contributing \$500 annually, which amount, however, is matched dollar for dollar by the Carnegie Steel Co. This list only gives a few of the larger amounts that are contributed by the interests that are "keeping in constant touch with the River and Harbor Committee," to use an expression contained in the Portsmouth (Ohio) letter.

A \$5,000 TOUCH WITH PITTSBURGH.

"ON TO CAIRO."

OHIO VALLEY IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATION,

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,

No. 204 East Front Street, Cincinnati, Ohio, July 1, 1907.

To the business interests of Pittsburgh, Pa.:

The Ohio Valley Improvement Association in its work to secure legislation for the advancement of the movement to improve the Ohio River



from Pittsburgh to Cairo, on the basis of a 9-foot stage, with its consequent enhancement for transportation facilities, solicits financial cooperation, which is necessary in order that the work may proceed systematically and uninterruptedly.

Mr. John M. Williams, the general agent of the association, is authorized to receive and receipt for all moneys that may be subscribed. He is working under the direction of and reporting to the undersigned and officers of the association.

The records of the association for the past 12 years is a guaranty that all funds subscribed to the association will be devoted entirely and effectively to the work for which the association was formed, viz, the improvement of the Ohio River.

Very respectfully, yours,

JOHN L. VANCE, *President.*

J. F. ELLISON,  
*Secretary and Treasurer.*

We strongly approve the above, and urge the business interests of Pittsburgh to subscribe liberally to support and advance the work of the association.

JAMES A. HENDERSON,  
JOHN H. JONES,  
WM. B. RODGERS,  
*Vice Presidents.*

Standard Sanitary Manufacturing Co., per W. A. Myler, secretary and treasurer, July 9, 1907 (paid)	\$250
The Natural Gas Co. of West Virginia, by George Heard, president, July 10, 1907 (paid)	100
Clyde Coal Co., James G. Gegan, July 10, 1907 (paid)	100
Pittsburgh Forge & Iron Co., Calvin Wells, treasurer, July 11, 1907 (paid)	100
United Coal Co. (paid)	250
Midland Steel Co., Thomas C. Fowner, Jr., secretary (paid)	250
Joseph Horne Co., Darlton Horne, president (paid)	100
Lockhart Iron and Steel Co., C. I. Gussner, treasurer (paid)	100
Oil Well Supply Co., John Eaton, president (paid)	100
H. D. W. English, president chamber of commerce (paid)	100
J. M. Caffry (paid)	100
James W. Brown, president Colonial Steel Co. (paid)	100
United Engineering & Foundry Co., Lincoln Foundry Co., dept., the Lloyd Booth Co., dept., Chilled Roll Foundry Co., dept., Isaac W. Frank, president (paid)	100
The A. R. Budd Coal Co. (paid)	100
Logan Gregg Hardware Co. (paid)	100
The Phillips Mine & Mill Supply Co. (paid)	100
Mellon National Bank, by A. W. Mellon (paid)	100
McCreery & Co. (paid)	100
Arbuthnot-Stephenson Co., W. W. Miller, president (paid)	100
The National Supply Co. (paid)	100
Ward-Mokey Co. (paid)	50
The Pittsburgh Dry Goods Co., H. N. Neely, vice president and general manager (paid)	100
Pittsburgh Brewing Co., William Ruske, secretary (paid)	100
Pittsburgh Terminal Warehouse & Transfer Co., G. W. C. Johnston, secretary (paid)	100
James Rees & Sons Co., T. M. Rees (paid)	250
H. K. Porter Co., by W. E. Martin, treasurer (paid)	100
Chess Bros. (paid)	100
Rauh Bros. & Co. (paid)	50
American Natural Gas Co., X. Wittmer, president (paid)	100
Geo. K. Stevenson & Co. (paid)	50
Dilworth, Porter & Co. (Ld.), Sept. 9, 1907 (paid)	100
The Monongahela River Consolidated Coal & Coke Co., Francis L. Roffel (paid)	500
Thomas Carlin's Sons Co., Theodore W. McBride, treasurer (paid)	50
Carnegie Steel Co., W. W. Blackburn, secretary (paid)	500
Kaufmann Bros. (paid)	100
Kier Fire Brick Co., S. M. Kier (paid)	50
L. F. Smith (paid)	25
John B. Hains & Sons (paid)	50
Thomas C. Jenkins (paid)	50
E. W. Babcock Co. (paid)	50
J. K. Davison & Bro. (paid)	50
H. M. Brackenridge (paid)	25
Rosenbaum Co. (paid)	25
Independent Brewing Co. of Pittsburgh, Charles E. Succop, treasurer (paid)	100
Pittsburgh Steel Co., W. H. Rowe, president (paid)	100
Ernest Rusch (paid)	25
A. Dempster (paid)	50
Wayman & Wood Co., R. Wayman, Jr., secretary (paid)	25
Graham Nut Co., Albert Graham, president (paid)	25
James B. Sipe & Co. (paid)	25
Mackintosh, Hemphill & Co. (paid)	50
Zug Iron & Steel Co. (paid)	100
J. N. I'en (paid)	100
E. H. Jennings Bros. Co. (paid)	100
The Chapin Fulton Manufacturing Co. (paid)	25

I have other subscription lists that are of equal interest and amount, but I have refrained from introducing more than a single list from several cities, although annual contributions appear to have been generously made in different cases.

Have I made a case that deserves investigation? The suggestion by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] that the River and Harbor Committee intends to smother the resolutions asking for an investigation must have been made with authority. Ordinarily I would have no hesitation in leaving my case with any committee, and it is needless to express my high respect for the members of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, individually and collectively, but I do not believe any investigation ought to be undertaken unless it is serious and thorough in character.

No man would care to try his case before a judge or judges who were not impartial. The absurdity of wasting the time of that committee or of myself in a fruitless undertaking was apparent from the first, but courtesy compelled me to await its

orders. Now that it appears to be useless, I have undertaken to present to the House and to the country a portion of the evidence, most of which I believe to be original in character, and which has been held in my hands for the committee's use.

#### TRYING TO GET AT THE FACTS.

On May 4, nearly five months ago, I introduced House concurrent resolution No. 38. It proposed to secure information that would have opened up to the taxpayers, who foot the bills, concealed conditions behind the \$50,000,000 annual loot bill.

In its wisdom the Rivers and Harbors Committee, to which the resolution was referred and which prepares the annual bill, ignored the appeal for an investigation.

On August 25 I introduced House resolution No. 603, which sets forth the progress of the rivers and harbors bill after it left the House and reiterates a demand for an investigation. This resolution, affecting an annual grab of \$50,000,000 was too unimportant to receive any more attention than its predecessor, and as it presents some interesting propositions to the patient investigator I incorporate it in my remarks at this point:

[H. Res. 603. Sixty-third Congress, second session. In the House of Representatives, August 25, 1914. Mr. FREAK submitted the following resolution which was referred to the Committee on Rules and ordered to be printed.]

Whereas the rivers and harbors bill as it passed the House carried \$43,389,000 in cash and over \$76,000,000, including proposed dribbling appropriations, for new projects; and

Whereas the said rivers and harbors bill, now under consideration by another body, has had added to it by the committee of said body over \$10,000,000 in additional cash items over and above the \$43,000,000 contained in the House bill; and

Whereas some of the items so added had been previously refused approval and place in the bill by the House committee; and

Whereas the said committee of such other body has now stricken from said bill as passed by the House approximately \$1,000,000 alleged to have been for wasteful and vicious items, including \$12,000 for Mattawan Creek, \$47,000 for Kissimmee Creek, \$733,000, present and prospective, for Oklawaha Creek, and various amounts for other insignificant creeks; and

Whereas it is currently reported that a proposal is pending to strike from the \$53,000,000 rivers and harbors bill, now before another body, approximately \$10,000,000, thereby leaving the amount of the appropriation at practically the figures approved by the House, but upon different projects; and

Whereas the Chief Engineer of the Army is authoritatively quoted as stating that not more than one-half of 1 per cent contained in the present bill is "pork"; and

#### A \$93,000,000 PORK BARREL FOR 1914.

Whereas approximately \$7,000,000 has been appropriated by Congress during the present session by the sundry civil bill of 1914 for river and harbor improvements in addition to the pending bill of \$53,000,000 cash and \$33,000,000 new projects, or approximately \$93,000,000 in cash and new projects for 1914; and

Whereas press dispatches report that employees of a House committee have circulated letters of inquiry throughout the country asking if people of the particular locality affected by the 400 different projects included in said bill are ready to concede that the local project is a "humbug and a fraud"; and

Whereas House concurrent resolution 38, introduced on the 4th day of May, 1914, is now before said House committee for action and in words and substance is as follows:

Whereas many millions of dollars of public moneys are annually wasted on our rivers and an absence of businesslike methods is being pursued by the Government in carrying on river and harbor improvements, the following facts are submitted as a preamble in support of this resolution:

That on March 17, 1914, the chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee stated to the House as follows: "Why, there are propositions advanced, some of them are now before Congress, advocated and supported by men of national repute, the adoption and carrying out of which, it is said by competent engineers, would cost billions of dollars."

That river and harbor appropriations have increased approximately 500 per cent, while navigation on rivers has decreased 80 per cent, as is shown by the following Government data:

Appropriations for rivers and harbors: 1875 to 1894 (20 years), \$187,099,000; 1894 to 1904 (10 years), \$184,425,000; 1911 to 1914 (4 years), \$184,345,000.

The following river traffic is reported from the city of St. Louis: Missouri River, 1890, 31,385 tons; 1906, 6,050 tons; less, 80 per cent. Lower Mississippi, 1890, 765,880 tons; 1906, 141,575 tons; less, 81 per cent.

That commerce on practically all of the inland waterways, excepting the Great Lakes, has greatly decreased and often been driven from the rivers by railway competition.

That the Interstate Commerce Commission and railway commissions of the several States have general powers to reduce railway freight rates wherever conditions warrant and to prevent increase wherever reduction has been made.

That the river and harbor bill for 1914 as passed by the House appropriates or authorizes an expenditure of \$43,289,004, in addition to \$32,895,871 in new projects begun and to be maintained by continuing appropriations from future Congresses, in all calling for a proposed expenditure of \$76,184,875. To this vast amount, judging from past experience, will be added from \$4,000,000 to \$5,000,000 before the bill is returned from the Senate.

That the adopted projects which we are obligated to complete, including those embraced in the 1914 bill, include a future expenditure of \$305,500,000.

That in addition thereto the Army engineers have recommended 93 new projects, which will require a further expenditure of \$92,500,000 whenever Congress can be prevailed upon to make such appropriations.

That 120 additional surveys are authorized by the 1914 bill as it passed the House, which will require an indefinite amount for such projects, possibly reaching \$100,000,000, judging from the average last noted;

## BILLIONS OF DOLLARS FOR PORK BARRELS.

That to these extravagant expenditures will eventually be added billions of dollars, according to the opinion of the chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House, whenever men of national repute now advocating and supporting other projects can secure their adoption;

That the 1914 bill as it passed the House appropriates \$9,500,000 for the Mississippi River, 84 per cent of which is to be expended on the lower river, notwithstanding its commerce decreased over 80 per cent during the past 20 years;

That the Mississippi River Commission on April 14, 1914, at St. Louis, recommended to Congress a further appropriation of \$12,000,000 for the Mississippi River for next year;

That the 1914 bill as it passed the House appropriates \$2,000,000 for the lower Missouri River between Kansas City and the Mississippi, which appropriation is part of a \$20,000,000 project for that portion of the river, notwithstanding traffic is negligible and actual commerce is alleged to have cost the Government approximately \$100 per ton for 1912;

That the 1914 bill as it passed the House appropriates \$5,000,000 for canalization along the Ohio River, a \$64,000,000 project, comprehending 63 locks, but no part of the open-river service. Canal freight for 1912 is alleged to have cost the Government over \$35 per ton, after allowing full railway freight rates for coal traffic;

That after spending many millions of dollars on the Coosa, Trinity, Brazos, and Red Rivers, these projects are now alleged to be of no practical benefit to navigation.

That the intracoastal waterways project, present and postponed, as reported by the Government engineers, involves a past, present, and proposed expenditure of \$96,931,000;

That this system includes the construction of new canals of doubtful value, the purchase, through the 1914 bill, of a bankrupt canal proposition, the stock of which is shown to be worthless; of projects that propose to especially benefit certain communities to the injury of others, and projects which it is alleged will drive legitimate private waterway ventures into bankruptcy;

That the 1914 bill as passed by the House contains appropriations for projects where the expenditure, according to engineers' reports, is exclusively for local private business interests and not for use by the general public;

That the 1914 bill as passed by the House contains appropriations for creeks which, according to the accompanying engineers' reports, are dry for eight months in the year;

That the 1914 bill as passed by the House contains appropriations for creeks involving in a single instance an appropriation of \$750,000, wherein it is alleged the engineers' report was reversed after real estate speculators had brought political pressure to bear in such case;

That the 1914 bill does not carry appropriations for the amount required to complete projects as asked for by the engineers in many cases, thereby preventing the Government from entering into proper or profitable contracts until full appropriations are made;

That the 1914 bill is open to all the objections urged by President Taft against the 1910 bill for the last mentioned reasons and contains wasteful appropriations amounting to many millions of dollars; Therefore, for the foregoing reasons, it is

## LET THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION INVESTIGATE.

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring).* That the Interstate Commerce Commission be, and hereby is, authorized and directed to immediately investigate and as soon as practicable report to Congress the following information:

First. The character and amount of proposed expenditures by the Government now being advocated and supported "by men of national repute," as stated on the floor of the House, the adoption and carrying out of which will cost billions of dollars.

Second. The character and value to the general public of projects to which the Government is now committed aggregating \$305,000,000.

Third. The character and value to the general public of 93 new projects recommended by Army engineers but not yet adopted by Congress, which will require a further expenditure of \$92,500,000.

Fourth. The character and value to the general public of 120 new surveys authorized by the 1914 bill as it passed the House, which will require an indefinite amount reaching to over \$100,000,000, based on average last noted, providing such projects are recommended by the Army engineers.

Fifth. To report all river or harbor projects begun and afterwards abandoned by the Government within the past 40 years, together with all expenditures so wasted and reasons for such abandonment.

Sixth. To report as to the truth or falsity of the statement made upon the floor of the Senate that "the whole scheme of river improvement is a humbug and a steal," and to report further as to the truth or falsity of statements made during debate in the House that the river and harbor bill for 1914 as it passed the House is a fraud upon the people, a pork-barrel raid upon the Federal Treasury, approximating in its scope an expenditure of over \$76,000,000, and more vicious in character than any of its predecessors.

Seventh. To investigate and report all active influences urging the adoption of the Mississippi River reclamation, the Ohio River canalization, the Delaware & Chesapeake Canal, and other projects contained in the 1914 bill as it passed the House, together with the names of all organizations, companies, individuals, or hired lobbyists now actively engaged in urging such projects.

## INVESTIGATE THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER LAND RECLAMATION SCHEME.

Eighth. To report fully as to the Mississippi River reclamation project, its probable cost, local benefits to be conferred, and value of any lands to be reclaimed: the ownership of such lands; the contributions equitably required from adjoining States, municipalities, or individual interests, if any; the injuries to Memphis, Vicksburg, or other communities alleged on the floor of the House to have been caused by ill-advised engineering projects, and further to report as to the permanence of the reclamation project and probable value compared with Government expenditures required.

Ninth. To investigate and report as to the desirability of having the Government take over the Chesapeake & Delaware Canal at double its actual value fixed by the House committee; to report whether the canal company stock is worthless and its bonds valued at only 50 cents on the dollar, as stated on the floor of the House; to report whether this canal project can be completed for \$10,514,290, as estimated by the Army engineers; to report whether such amount includes the Government contribution of \$450,000, made about 90 years ago, and interest and dividends wrongfully withheld during that period; and to

report further whether or not the project is to be taken over for the especial benefit of canal bondholders and shipping interests of Baltimore and Philadelphia. In making such investigation the commission is directed to not limit its hearings to stock and bond holders of the canal company, or to local political influences or interested shipping interests of Baltimore and Philadelphia.

Tenth. To report further what river and harbor projects now under consideration are for the benefit of strictly private business interests, without corresponding benefits to the general public, and the interests that secured such projects for such interests.

Eleventh. To report what proportionate benefits should occasion contributions, and to what extent, from local communities, particularly where improvements are of strictly local value and of no material aid to navigation.

Twelfth. To report the financial policy or absence of policy pursued by the Government as to the rivers and harbors during the past 40 years; benefits that have accrued to the public through improved river navigation and increased river traffic, if any, resulting from such improvements, together with all further available information on the subject that may be had, together with such recommendations based thereon as may be found proper to make in the premises, having particular reference to the following information:

Thirteenth. To report the practicability of taking away from the Chief of Army Engineers the exclusive right and power of determining the commercial necessity of river and harbor projects and leaving with the Army Engineer Bureau the single question of technical engineering work.

Fourteenth. To report the practicability of turning over to the Interstate Commerce Commission or the Department of Commerce all river and harbor improvements, with full power to exercise all the duties now imposed upon the Army Engineer Bureau, excepting such duties as strictly pertain to civil engineering; and

## LET THE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE INVESTIGATE.

Whereas no report has been made to the House in reference to such resolution, nor has any hearing been called for its consideration: Therefore be it

*Resolved.* That the House Judiciary Committee, in lieu of the Interstate Commerce Commission, be requested to hold hearings upon said resolution (H. Res. 38) at the earliest practicable day and to report to the House its findings, in order that the House membership may be informed as to the facts contained in recitals in such resolutions.

*Resolved further.* That said committee be directed to ascertain from the Chief of Engineers of the Army what \$260,000 contained in the rivers and harbors bill, being approximately one-half of 1 per cent, is conceded to be "pork."

*Resolved further.* That such committee be directed to ascertain if the appropriations struck out of the bill for the Kissimmee, Mattawan, Oklawaha, and other creeks, amounting to approximately \$1,000,000, consist of wasteful and improper items, as found by the committee of another body.

*Resolved further.* That such committee be directed to ascertain if the additional amount of \$10,000,000 in items proposed to be struck out by such other committee consists, as alleged, of wasteful and improper items.

*Resolved further.* That such committee ascertain the importance and character of the \$10,000,000 added to the House bill of \$43,000,000 by such other committee, and that the result of such investigation be reported to the House at the earliest possible moment, together with its recommendations thereon; and the said Judiciary Committee is hereby authorized and empowered to issue subpoenas and examine witnesses and to procure all documents bearing upon the matters referred to, and to employ needed stenographers and clerks in the prosecution of such inquiry.

## AN EFFORT TO INVESTIGATE THE DREDGERS' PUSH.

Having proof of the dredgers' secret agreement to push pork barrels, which I have already placed in my remarks, together with the confidential list furnished to the collector of the Rivers and Harbors Congress, supported by subscriptions from the dredgers to push the \$50,000,000 barrel, and with a full understanding that the terrific back-fire waged on Congress was part of a concerted action which would not stand up in the light of publicity, I offered House resolution No. 612, asking for an investigation of the activities of the dredgers' secret organization, that reads as follows:

[H. Res. 612, Sixty-third Congress, second session. In the House of Representatives, August 29, 1914. Mr. FREAR submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and ordered to be printed.]

Whereas the press of the country has been giving consideration to the unprecedented haul on the Treasury sought to be made by the \$53,000,000 rivers and harbors bill for 1914, which bill, with future dribbling appropriations for new projects, will reach approximately \$86,000,000; and

Whereas \$45,000,000 of unexpended appropriations is still available for contracts now being performed; and

Whereas a further sum of \$6,900,000 has been appropriated by the present Congress, under the sundry civil bill for 1914, for the improvement of rivers and harbors; and

Whereas it is probable that nine hundred and ninety-nine persons out of every thousand receive no benefits, directly or indirectly, from the large mass of 1914 appropriations; that the great majority of our people are ignorant of the unprecedented size and wasteful character of the 1914 river and harbor bill disclosed by engineers and other governmental reports; and

Whereas, notwithstanding such overwhelming popular disapproval, a persistent secret back-fire has been inaugurated in the several States to the end that commercial bodies and individuals of local influence are now engaged in importuning Members of Congress to pass the \$53,000,000 bill in addition to the \$6,900,000 sundry civil items already enacted into the law and the \$45,000,000 left available on June 30 last; and

Whereas the secret back-fire is believed to have been largely inaugurated by individuals and concerns having personal interests in performing the work, or by communities and individuals favorable to some particular project irrespective of the remaining hundreds of projects, many of which have been exposed as wasteful and useless almost beyond belief; and



Whereas it is alleged that the dredgers of the country have in past years, through their official organization, sought to actively and secretly influence the passage of river and harbor legislation, as appears from the following extract, quoted from a report of the board of directors of the Atlantic and Gulf Coast Dredge Owners' Association, issued after the defeat of a former river and harbor bill, which extract from the signed report reads as follows:

#### DIVIDING THE SPOILS.

"We count in this association the membership and influence of every man engaged in the business: each one has something of value to us in the way of ideas, talent, energy, or influence, and it is the work of the association and its proper object and function to use these various factors for the benefit of the whole membership and to throw upon any desired point the full resources of the association. In this way, and by turning its steps in the right direction, and with full confidence and cooperation which it would then have from all its members, there would no longer be any grounds for contention or rivalry amongst one another. When once this department of allotment is abandoned, the association will once more resume its proper place and perform many duties of the highest use and importance to its members." (An apparent admission that all contracts are, or were, controlled by the board of directors and subsequently allotted to the different members by a dredging trust); and

Whereas the directors' report further states:

"The board should organize a bureau of information, which would furnish to each member at regular intervals a synopsis of what is going on in the way of dredging operations on the coast, improvements in machinery or in methods of doing work, with descriptions of such improvements, locations, etc., and the general work being done by and through committees and in the board of directors—this and such other additional information as may suggest itself.

"The lack of association methods and the failure to use the means in our hands for the general good was forcibly illustrated recently in the rivers and harbors bill, where absolutely no effort was made by the association to procure any amendment to the bill or any provision inserted therein for its benefit"; and

#### FILLING UP MEMBERS OF CONGRESS.

Whereas the directors' report states:

"Your board feels regret that the river and harbor bill has failed of passage, and considers it all the more important that the association should be organized for the purpose of adding its influence to urging work by municipal organizations and bodies, and doing all in their power to create offerings of work in the various ports of entry and harbors. It is only by persistent effort that the loss entailed upon us by the failure of the harbor bill can in any way be compensated for. Your board further wishes to emphasize their regret that the annual banquet of the association has been allowed to go by default for the last two or three years. These entertainments do not entail any serious expense upon the association, but they do create the greatest possible prestige for our business in the estimation of those whose favor it is to our advantage to gain. Influential business men and men of public affairs having to do with transportation companies and steamship lines are entertained by us on these occasions with the greatest possible benefit to our business—municipal officers, heads of departments, Members of Congress, and legislatures—and their favor and interest is legitimately gained and has been found to be of the greatest value when circumstances required it. The expense of our entertainment is wisely expended, and brings an adequate return for every dollar so spent"; and

Whereas it is reasonable to believe from such statements that said dredgers' association is secretly and actively aiding in the back fire now being urged upon Congress by commercial bodies that are particularly interested over their local projects, and to the exclusion of other items, good, bad, and indifferent, and, further, that said board may now control all dredging contracts, as suggested in such report, to be hereafter allotted to the different members; and

Whereas House resolution 603, heretofore introduced, asks the Judiciary Committee of the House to investigate the present system of making up river and harbor appropriations, and for other information relating thereto, as is more specifically set forth in said resolution, and to include all secret lobby methods used heretofore and now to urge the passage of such bills; Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Judiciary Committee of the House be instructed to bring before it the officers and board of directors of the Atlantic and Gulf Coast Dredge Owners' Association, and such other parties as may be deemed advisable, and ascertain what efforts have been exerted toward securing the passage of the rivers and harbors bills in past years, its methods of allotments of contracts, and what connection, if any, such organization or the membership thereof have with the remarkable secret back fire now being urged in Congress in behalf of the 1914 bill.

#### A WAR TAX AND THE LOBBY.

In a further effort to attract publicity to the back-fire waged by the officers of the \$50,000,000 annual loot, war cry bill, that had \$9,000,000 at stake for the lower Mississippi land reclamation scheme, as heretofore set forth, I introduced House concurrent resolution No. 49. It refers to the activities of the officers of the Rivers and Harbors Congress, and is as follows:

[H. Con. Res. 49. Sixty-third Congress, second session. In the House of Representatives September 17, 1914. Mr. FREAK submitted the following concurrent resolution, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.]

Whereas the President has asked Congress to pass a war tax of \$100,000,000, to be imposed upon 100,000,000 consumers in the country, for the purpose of meeting expenses of Government, including an anticipated wasteful rivers and harbors appropriation bill now pending before Congress amounting to \$3,000,000, and also for an additional \$52,000,000 for rivers and harbors, which last-mentioned amount is a balance authorized to be expended from preceding appropriations; and

Whereas the total proposed expenditures for rivers and harbors in 1914 is six times the total expenditures for the four years from 1875 to 1878, inclusive, when commerce on the rivers of the country carried four times the present diminishing traffic, according to Government reports; and

Whereas the proposed \$105,000,000 expenditures for rivers and harbors, for which a war tax must be levied, includes many millions of dollars of wasteful and extravagant projects, according to the opinion of experienced waterway experts throughout the country; and

Whereas the demand for a war tax directs public attention to the present extravagant business management of the country which reaches in appropriations, exclusive of rivers and harbors, the unprecedented sum of \$1,057,605,694.40 for 1914 and \$1,089,408,777.26 for 1915, and which latter amount exceeds all appropriations for 1913 by over \$100,000,000; and

Whereas any demand for a war tax to meet unparalleled expenditures for rivers and harbors or for other Government purposes directs public attention toward insidious lobbies that seek to shape legislation at Washington and perform other functions not contemplated under the Constitution; and

Whereas the National Rivers and Harbors Congress and the Mississippi Levee Association are alleged to be practically identical in aims and character; organized primarily to advance lower Mississippi River land reclamation interests, interests which are given by the 1914 rivers and harbors bill the unprecedented sum of \$9,000,000, part of over \$100,000,000, counting unexpended balances previously appropriated for waterway purposes; a large part of which enormous fund, in the judgment of the best and most experienced waterway experts in the country, is to be wasted on crooked creeks and ill-advised waterway projects; and

#### INVESTIGATE THE BACK FIRE.

Whereas it is alleged on trustworthy authority that the National Rivers and Harbors Congress has sent thousands of letters throughout the country and has also sent its agents to different points in the country extending from the Atlantic coast on the east to Astoria, Ore., on the west, in order to persuade local commercial organizations to pass resolutions which demand the passage of the 1914 rivers and harbors bill, and further demand the constant attendance of Members of Congress to preserve a quorum in order to pass such a bill; and

Whereas the National Rivers and Harbors Congress and its kindred Lower Mississippi River Levee Association has been charged by a reputable waterway organization with instigating threats against Pennsylvania manufacturers and other eastern business men in order to compel the support of local Members of Congress for lower Mississippi River projects in the manner and form set forth in H. Res. 613; and

Whereas it is alleged that through secret, insidious, persistent, and unprecedented lobbying methods southern river contractors and other parties interested in the passage of the 1914 rivers and harbors bill are demanding, as a price of transacting business with Ohio manufacturers, immediate efforts by such Ohio business men to compel support of such vicious bill by Ohio Representatives in either branch of Congress; and

Whereas it is further alleged that the National Rivers and Harbors Congress with its affiliated Lower Mississippi River Levee Association has sought to have enacted into law Louisiana House bill No. 514, which bill endeavors to make legal contributions of \$1,000 annually by all State levee boards in order "to encourage the growth of public sentiment favoring increased national appropriations for the construction and maintenance of the system of Mississippi River levees"; and

#### LET US ASCERTAIN RAILWAY INFLUENCES.

Whereas it is further alleged in addition to contributions sought to be obtained from the State of Louisiana to secure increased Federal appropriations for the lower Mississippi River, hundreds of thousands of dollars have been collected by the National Rivers and Harbors Congress and the Mississippi Levee Association, including annual contributions from thousands of organizations throughout the United States including the Newark Board of Trade; the Trenton Board of Trade; the Standard Oil Trust; the International Harvester Trust; the Southern Railway Co.; the Mobile & Ohio Railway Co.; the Frisco Railway Co.; the Missouri Pacific Railway Co.; the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co.; the Illinois Central Railway Co.; and thousands of other firms and individuals as set forth in part by H. Res. 613; and

Whereas it is further alleged that many thousands of dollars thus collected by the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, from boards of trade, the Standard Oil Trust, contracting companies, and other individuals throughout the country were divided equally between the collecting agents of said "congress" and the "congress" itself, which congress retained one-half of the amount collected and yet declares itself to be second only to the Congress of the United States; and

Whereas such charge if true is a fraud upon all the contributors to such great fund, raised ostensibly to further improvements of waterways, but which fund is alleged to be used in entertaining and banqueting officials in high authority and for other lobbying purposes heretofore stated, in order to insure the passage of an annual \$50,000,000 pork barrel through "a species of mutual bribery among those actively interested, all too much in evidence for the health of public morals and interests of the tax-paying public," according to the report of the New York Board of Trade and Transportation, as set forth in H. Res. 613; and

Whereas it is alleged that said National Rivers and Harbors Congress, through its officers and agents and through its large fund collected as aforesaid, has assumed to determine the political fortunes of Senators and Representatives, the membership and composition of important congressional committees, the particular projects for which appropriations shall be granted, and the amount thereof, all of which if true is demoralizing to public legislation and the best interests of the country; and

Whereas if the foregoing allegations are true as contained in the report of the New York Board of Trade and Transportation; and as to allegations of equal division of subscription between the congress and its agents; and as to use of such money to send agents throughout the country to make false and improper statements as to the character of the vicious 1914 rivers and harbors bill; and as to activity of such agents in order to secretly and improperly influence the consideration of such bill; and as to efforts to force eastern business men to favor the Mississippi River reclamation project, and also efforts to force Ohio business men into creating a back fire against their Representatives in Congress; and as to other insidious and manifestly improper acts, then and in such case the Postmaster General ought to prohibit the use of the mails for such questionable and improper purposes: Therefore be it



*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring).* That the Attorney General is hereby directed to ascertain the facts of such charges hereinbefore set forth, and if true in whole or in part to proceed without delay in prosecuting any and all parties engaged in unlawful practices, and to take such further action as may be deemed proper.

This resolution and others of similar tenor were given some degree of publicity and also attracted criticism from reputable journals. My attempts to secure an investigation received attention and strong support from many high-class publications throughout the country, including in the West notably the Chicago Tribune, but the Herald of that city questioned a "fanaticism rather than reason" in the following editorial, which I quote under date of September 17:

[From the Chicago Record-Herald, September 17.]

CONGRESSMAN FREAR GOES TOO FAR.

Representative FREAR, of Wisconsin, has done the country much good service by his persistence in calling attention to the "pork" in the river and harbor bill. But in his present attack on organizations of citizens formed to promote internal improvements Mr. FREAR is showing fanaticism rather than reason.

No brief is held here for the organizations called the Rivers and Harbors Congress or the Mississippi Levee Association. It is merely remarked that they are visibly composed, in the main, of respectable citizens, who should not be accused of anything in the nature of corrupt activities in legislation unless upon clear proof.

It is altogether probable, of course, that promoters of wasteful and useless expenditures have attached themselves to these organizations. Attempts are always made to attach schemes of private or merely local gain to any widespread movement. Quite possibly these organizations have been unduly tolerant of "log-rolling" tactics.

What Mr. FREAR forgets, however, is that there are some meritorious projects in the pending bill. It may be admitted that the ratio of them to the "pork" is more than usually low. Yet they are there, and should not be made to suffer because they are unavoidably in bad company.

Let Mr. FREAR cease to see ghosts of "insidious lobbies" and devote himself to getting the "pork" out of the bill. There is plenty of it to get out.

Here is an editor of a great journal asking us with childlike innocence to get the "pork" out of a bill, when he ought to know it could not be blown out with dynamite.

It is a matter of record that of scores of wasteful, vicious items exposed on the floor, no record vote could be had. In another body the vicious Trinity River \$10,000,000 project only received a few votes of protest, although it was riddled by the criticisms of Senator BURTON and others. Good and bad projects float or sink together when in a pork barrel.

COMPLACENT IGNORANCE OF CONDITIONS.

No criticism is offered in reply to the editorial, because I do not reply to criticisms unless some good purpose may be served. The Herald is an influential paper and its voice on the side of the Government Treasury would be invaluable in these days of pork barrels, and war taxes with which to pay them. Probably a lack of knowledge of the real conditions may have inspired the charge.

Is it fanaticism to shout "Burglars" when you see the Treasury is being looted under the guise of waterway improvements? When land reclamationists, water-power interests, dredgers, contractors, and last, but not least, when a \$50,000,000 war cry for annual plunder is echoed throughout 171 cities and their respective States that contribute, is it fanaticism to demand the facts?

To declare that the management of a railway needs investigation when the president and directors of the New Haven loot the road, does not attack the stockholders of the road who are entertained by pretty balloons that are kept dancing before their eyes. The members of the Rivers and Harbors Congress are not to blame, excepting that every stockholder should know what use is made of his name and funds.

I do not care to inject my own individual views into any discussion, but there has been shown beyond reasonable doubt by Senators BURTON, KENYON, GALLINGER, and others in both Houses of Congress that present waterway improvements financed by the Government are largely vicious in character, and are used to cover up other purposes than actual improvements to navigation. These expositions have been based on the reports of the very engineers who approved projects that were all originally supported by political influence.

The engineers are no more to blame than are those who successfully urged the wasteful projects. That is a minor consideration at this time; nor is the defeat of the 1914 pork barrel, with its temporary saving of \$33,000,000 or \$66,000,000, as you choose to figure it, the real question which confronts Congress and the country.

I have produced evidence that has not been disputed, showing that since the Rivers and Harbors Congress, with its associated waterway organizations, has been organized, notwithstanding river and canal traffic, has rapidly decreased, annual Government expenditures for wasteful projects have doubled and quadrupled.

Legitimate waterway projects have been choked by this effort to arouse local "cupidity," as it was termed by the New York Board of Trade and Transportation. The battle cry of \$50,000,000 loot, without any attempt to control projects, aroused a vigorous protest from the leading commercial body of the country years ago.

In my remarks of June 3 I made reference to a report of the New York Board of Trade and Transportation, which had refused to join hands with the association now boosting the Mississippi River, because of the fact that the association was a "log-rolling" concern founded on "mutual bribery." I have been asked to give in full this report, which was made by the New York board after a careful investigation into the methods of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. Believing that a report coming from one of the highest trade bodies of the world is of especial importance at this time, particularly as it relates to a proposal to siphon \$50,000,000 annually from the Federal Treasury, I herewith present the report containing its refusal to indorse what it denominates to be a mutual bribery organization:

THE NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS.

New York, March 27, 1907.

To the New York Board of Trade and Transportation:

The undersigned special committee, appointed to consider the policy that this board should adopt toward the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, reports as follows:

The National Rivers and Harbors Congress is an alliance of individuals, firms, and corporations, waterway associations, and other organizations. It has a president, an executive committee, and a secretary-treasurer. The members of the association pay annual dues. Its object, as stated in its circulars, is "to arouse public interest to such an extent that a united demand, coming from all sections of the country for regular and adequate rivers and harbors appropriations, will induce Congress to provide an annual river and harbor bill of \$50,000,000."

The New York Board of Trade and Transportation is invited and urged to become a member of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress.

The chairman of your committee personally conferred with a representative of the organization and has been fully informed of its purposes and methods. Its whole work, as stated in the objects quoted, is to be directed toward making an effective demand upon Congress for appropriations. Its policy is that no specific projects of public improvement shall be individually indorsed by the organization. A general indorsement is given to all projects heretofore approved by the United States engineers and the completion of which would require from \$320,000,000 to \$350,000,000; but no effort is made to ascertain or verify the necessity of such projects and plans.

The organization, while advocating and demanding enormous and unprecedented appropriations from the Public Treasury, thus cleverly attempts to avoid all the responsibilities for its proper and honest expenditure. Another advantage to them of this policy is that they avoid all discussions among themselves over the questions of merit as to the projects proposed. They welcome to the support of their cause everybody who wants an appropriation from the Treasury, and none is repulsed. The wonder is their numbers are not larger.

This fact should somewhat allay the fears of the taxpayers of the country as to the result, and as actually less than 5 per cent of the commercial organizations of the country have espoused the cause, or less than one-sixth as many organizations as demanded the passage of railroad-rate legislation, not including as many more agricultural societies, the movement has thus far failed to develop enough strength to make it dangerous.

It is manifest that such a plan should appeal strongly to many localities whose natural conditions are forbidding and unattractive to commerce and whose commerce is consequently small. It is quite within reasonable expectation that the people of such localities would be encouraged to hope or believe that by uniting to swell the demand for larger appropriations enough might be drawn from the Treasury to satisfy the demands of more necessitous projects and leave them a little by way of reward for their help and to encourage them to continue their "interest and cooperation." Every congressional district thus enlisted would deliver one additional vote in Congress for the blanket proposition.

THE PRESSURE ON CONGRESSMEN.

Nearly every Congressman is charged with procuring an appropriation for some project in his district. The approval of his constituency and often his reelection depends upon his success in getting an appropriation. He can not question the merits of the project for which such demands are made upon him. He may know that the project has no just claim upon the room of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors until he has worried a promise from the chairman. Thus the chairman of the committee has his troubles. It is a most Herculean task to sift out the bad and decide upon the merits of the numerous propositions which are brought to his attention. It requires most patient, painstaking study on his part to inform himself and to make sure that he is not imposed upon, and he must have extraordinary discretion, tact, and courage to put off importunate Congressmen and reject projects which investigation has convinced him are unworthy. Necessary projects must be passed for the good of the country and votes must be had to pass them. Frequently the price of a needed vote or several votes is the recognition of a project which would not otherwise have any consideration, and to get the important projects through the sacrifice is made, and so the bill is loaded. When the bill comes into the House with such items on it there is no one to object, because few, if any, of the Members know about the individual items. Even when occasionally a particularly objectionable item has been singled out for criticism in the newspapers, there is none to protest against it on the floor, because each Member must have his particular appropriation and it is understood that if the bill is to pass it must stand pat or fall as a whole. When one part of its structure is withdrawn, the harmony of the situation is gone and disintegration sets in.

The policy of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress would make the task no easier for the chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee. There would be more money to go around, but if the Rivers and Harbors Congress should succeed in their plan "to arouse public



interest—they should have said 'cupidity'—to such an extent that a united demand, coming from all sections of the country," would develop new schemes of improvement before unheard of, the demands upon him for unworthy projects would be increased far out of proportion to the worthy ones, and so the difficulties would be aggravated.

#### ORGANIZED FOR MUTUAL BRIBERY.

It would foster beyond all previous experience the most pernicious of all methods of procuring legislation, known as "logrolling," a species of mutual bribery among those actively interested already too much in evidence for the health of public morals and the interests of the tax-paying public.

The present system may not be ideal, but the responsibility and power imposed in the important office of chairman of the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors develops in the incumbent a conservatism and care for the public weal which establishes conditions and works out the problems in a way which it would be difficult to improve upon. The country has been in recent years especially fortunate in this respect. Mistakes may have been made. Some projects may have been for a time neglected which should have been more rapidly progressed, and some may have received more recognition than their importance would seem to warrant, but a proper appreciation of the difficulties of the office would foster a spirit of charity and compel commendation instead of criticism.

In conclusion, we desire to make our position clear. As an organization we have done much for the improvement of the water transportation. We may stand upon our record as to that, and will not swerve from our faith in the future; but we are opposed to the plans of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, and urge the business interests of the country to consider carefully the evils of the system which would result from its success.

It is the duty and should be the care of the exponent organizations throughout the country to guard at all times the public interests of the city, State, and Nation with unswerving integrity of purpose and to encourage by every means at their command the highest possible standard of action in all the affairs of our public life. They can not, without doing an injury to the body politic, shift from their own shoulders to others any responsibility which they themselves should assume. They can not, without giving conscientious and painstaking study and consideration, indorse important projects and measures or general and vaguely defined policies and leave to others the working of them out to a conclusion without danger of harm. The conditions inherent in our public life are such that the gravest dangers attend and menace the interests of the people at each step from the initiation and promotion to the consummation of all public measures and works under every branch of our Government. These conditions make easier the evasion of individual responsibility and discourage the expression of opposition to measures which appeal to the individual conscience as wrong. They foster cupidity and encourage duplicity and fraud, and where the objects in view depend for success upon access to the Public Treasury the moral resistance is relaxed.

We therefore view with apprehension this systematic propaganda by influential men and organizations, which our experience and judgment tells us, unless checked by the more conservative elements of the people, will ultimately lead to the wildest extravagance and waste of the public moneys which has ever marked our history.

#### REFUSES TO JOIN A "LOG-ROLLING" ORGANIZATION.

Your committee therefore recommends that the New York Board of Transportation and Trade decline the request to become a member of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress.

While expressing our disapproval of the methods of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress we have great pleasure in commending the action of President Roosevelt in appointing on the 14th of the present month the Inland Waterways Commission, whose duty will be to report a comprehensive plan for the improvement and control of the river systems of the United States. The President in his letter of appointment to the members of the commission, who have been manifestly selected for their eminent qualifications and fitness for the duty imposed, outlines at length his views, which are patriotic, broad, and comprehensive. The appointment of the Inland Waterways Commission is, to our minds, a first important step in the right direction, which gives promise of the development of a national plan, taking knowledge of all river improvements which should properly be nationalized, and eliminating the elements of danger to which we have heretofore referred.

Upon such a plan, which will indicate in advance what improvements are contemplated, what they will accomplish for the welfare of the country, and what they will cost, all the organizations of the country should unite.

Respectfully submitted.

S. V. V. HUNTINGTON, *Chairman*,  
W. S. ARMSTRONG,  
CHAS. H. PATRICK,  
EUGENE H. CONKLIN,  
THOS. F. MAIN.

*Special Committee.*

The foregoing report was unanimously adopted by the New York Board of Trade and Transportation March 27, 1907.

A true copy.

Attest:

FRANK S. GARDNER, *Secretary.*

#### A PORK-BARREL PROPHECY REALIZED.

The predictions made in that report appear to have been fully realized. An organization now controls the annual \$50,000,000 pork barrel that has no responsibility to the people. It assumes to determine river and harbor legislation. Its battle cry is for \$50,000,000 annually, and it makes no difference whether it goes to the fertilizing factories at Mattawan, at Shoal Harbor, or on the North East River, as disclosed by the Engineers' reports. It is immaterial whether it covers real estate interests on Florida projects or \$9,000,000 in 1914 for a Mississippi River reclamation project. Everything goes, and when opposition develops in Congress, all the machinery at the disposal of the Rivers and Harbors Congress is put into force, demanding the pork bill's passage by a secret back-fire.

If it be fanaticism to say this astounding condition surrounding a great appropriation bill is wrong, then what is right? The puny efforts of Mulhall and the Manufacturers'

Association sink into insignificance when compared with the \$50,000,000 annual pork barrel, the guardianship of which amount the Federal Congress delegates to the Rivers and Harbors Congress, according to modest admissions of the latter body.

I have given more time to this subject than I intended, although I have only been able to briefly point out the wastefulness of the Mississippi land reclamation and flood project and the influences that are behind the \$50,000,000 annual pork barrel.

#### WORKING FOR A NEW PORK BARREL.

Congress has been notified through many channels that the Rivers and Harbors Congress, which meets here during the coming December, will be here when Congress is in session. A thousand waterway enthusiasts who do not know the secret work of their congress will then press on the Federal Congress a \$50,000,000 or \$60,000,000 pork barrel for 1915 in order to carry \$12,000,000 demanded by the Mississippi River Commission for a wasteful levee system.

We protest against abrogating to engineers the constitutional power of Congress to determine where \$20,000,000 is to go. Why not protest against an abrogation of our constitutional power to legislate for navigation, which appears to have been assumed by the second congress, and which encompasses every known interest apart from actual navigation that could be crowded into a pork barrel. All constitutional bars against such expenditures for local interests are now swept away. The battle cry of a Rivers and Harbors Congress, which controls the situation, is for \$50,000,000 loot, irrespective of projects. Is it not a serious condition that should challenge the attention of thoughtful Members of Congress? A pressure for local projects has ever been instrumental in tying hands that otherwise would be raised against the pork barrel. Ninety-nine per cent of our people would protest against the barrel and the system behind it if these facts could be brought home to them. Yet they are to be called upon in 1915 to pay an inexcusable war tax for pork barrels. A congressional investigation would serve to give needed publicity, if made exhaustive. It would save many millions of dollars annually to our people, but more important from a legislative point of view, it would remove from a control of \$50,000,000 annually an organization that has grown arrogant and powerful beyond comprehension, that gives its orders through its local members for Senators to stay on the job and work for the pork barrel; that collects unknown amounts of money from innocent contributors, paying 50 per cent collection fees in certain cases; an organization which has injected into pork-barrel legislation of former years an element of cheek and phenomenal nerve both astounding and wicked in its influence.

Until such an investigation can be had and until a change in the system of making appropriations for rivers and harbors is inaugurated, the pork barrel will thrive and grow and be a constant menace to the Federal Treasury.

#### HOW TO STOP PORK BARRELS.

The abolishment of pork-barrel legislation can be brought about by a strong advisory board of high-class men, to include Army and civil engineers and members of the Cabinet. This board ought to be appointed by the President and to have supervision of all waterways, making its annual recommendations to Congress in the same manner that Cabinet officials present their recommendations.

A board of this character would be opposed by this Rivers and Harbors Congress and many affiliated associations, because the usefulness of the second congress has not been directed toward developing legitimate navigation, but toward the accumulation of an annual \$50,000,000 pork-barrel fund from out the Federal Treasury.

Good projects would be approved by a high-class board and worthless, wasteful projects discarded. These latter projects, and there are many of them, together with political pull, will join hands in opposing any change in the present disgraceful system.

Congress can cure a growing cancer only by using the surgeon's knife. Such cure would reduce the present heavy tax burdens and give many millions of dollars annually to legitimate governmental expenditures.

More important by far, such change in handling the waterway problem would make short shrift of the annual legislative curse which poisons all other legislation by its system of barter and trade and other influences with which it comes in contact.

We have smashed the 1914 barrel, or knocked it down into kegs size, but in character it is still a generous sample of the larger barrel. Apart from the saving in funds, no permanent good has yet been accomplished. We must eliminate the gratuitous makers of the barrel—the Rivers and Harbors Congress—or, rather, the officials who assume to and who do exercise a vicious influ-

ence in determining the general character and amount of river and harbor appropriations. We have unconsciously abrogated powers possessed by the Federal Congress to this "Second Congress," powers that have been grossly abused. Let us place the power and responsibility in the hands of a high-class board which will command the confidence of the American Congress and of the country.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON].

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasant diversion to study the Members of a great body like this. Here we find the faithful public servant, the sincere economist, the sensational reformer, and the blatant demagogue.

It is the first two classes that dominate our membership, that transacts the public business, preserves the high standard of the House, and reflects credit upon the country.

The latter two classes are few in numbers, but conspicuously prominent by their frequency of speech and wildness of assertion. They ascribe unto themselves the virtues of the world and see no good in others. They win public favor through misrepresentation and hold it through false pretenses.

They play upon the ignorant and unwary, create a sentiment of suspicion and a feeling of unrest that breeds anarchy and makes socialists. They crave publicity and thirst for notoriety. Their entrance into public life is always a pity and their exit swift and sure.

The people of this country are fair and intelligent and will not be fooled. What they want from us is sincerity, not hypocrisy; action, not protestation; results, not criticism.

I hope my friend who has just taken his seat will not ascribe what I have said to himself.

I have been interested in his fight, delighted at his patriotism, astonished at his knowledge, amazed at his results.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] modestly takes credit for having assisted greatly in having this bill reduced from \$43,000,000 to \$20,000,000. For my part, if the gentleman thinks that to take \$23,000,000 from the improvement of the great waterways of this country is a feather in his cap, then I say, "Take it and wear it where all the country may see it." And when, sir, you show it to your people, tell them that it is a prize that you have won for having affected the commerce that goes out of the harbors of this country, carrying the products of our soil and industries and bringing back the gold of the world.

Tell them that you have won it by preventing river improvements, thereby allowing the railroads of the country to continue to rob the consumers of the land by charging high and exorbitant freight rates.

Tell them that you have won it by preventing improvements on the Mississippi River, so that the rains that fall in your section and find outlet through the great river may in their mad rush to the sea sweep away the lives of my people and destroy their property. [Applause.]

I am afraid, though, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman's enthusiasm and love of the limelight has somewhat exaggerated in his own mind the result of his labors.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. HARRISON. I have not the time. I wish that I could.

Mr. BUTLER. I am sure of that.

Mr. HARRISON. When this bill was up for consideration in the House and before it was emasculated in the Senate through filibustering tactics, the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin apparently found no good in it and attempted to cure it of its defects and so-called "pork-barrel" symptoms by offering amendments to it. He had that right as a Member of this House, and his record on the bill then under consideration ought to reflect his true opinion of it; for I take it that he is that sincere and patriotic that he would certainly not sit here as a Member of this House, interested as he is against this so-called "pork-barrel" bill, and fail to endeavor to rid it of its many features that he considered objectionable by offering amendments to it. If there were objectionable features to it and he failed to exercise his right of offering amendments in order to rid the bill of them, the distinguished gentleman either confesses his ignorance of the subject or his unfaithfulness to his people. I am not willing to concede either, and I am sure that the gentleman will back me up in that statement.

Now, Mr. Speaker, after all his display of enthusiasm the sum total of all the amendments that he offered to the bill at that time amounted to \$568,225. In other words, if every amendment he offered had been adopted the bill in the House would have been reduced from \$43,289,004 to \$42,720,779; and yet he terms it a pork-barrel bill and attempts to create the impression throughout the country that it is a pork-barrel bill.

Mr. FREAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON. I can not yield now.

Mr. FREAR. I just wanted to correct the gentleman's statement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. HARRISON. Why do I say that the gentleman attempts that? Because his actions in this House prove it. He thirsts for notoriety. He hungers for publicity. That is a disease, and many public men have it. It might well be called "resolinitis." Its symptoms are offering resolutions, criticizing somebody or something, alleging sensational happenings in order to get in the public prints, and then allowing the resolutions to die.

On May 4, 1914, the distinguished gentleman was attacked with this malady. He offered a 10-page resolution, citing many whereases with respect to river and harbor improvements, and asked the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House to allow the Interstate Commerce Commission or the Department of Commerce to pass on rivers and harbors appropriations.

That was the last of that resolution, but it answered its purpose. He got his name in the papers.

On August 25 following he had a relapse of the disease and offered another resolution, containing 11 pages, which went to the Committee on Rules, reciting many whereases and asking the Judiciary Committee of the House to investigate the action of the Senate in increasing the House rivers and harbors bill by \$10,000,000 and to report to Congress their findings and recommendations—certainly an unusual action to be placed on the Judiciary Committee. That resolution has not since been heard of, but it served its purpose. He got his name in the papers.

Two days afterwards another resolution was offered by the gentleman and referred to the Committee on Rules asking the Appropriations Committee of the House to report to Congress whether an urgency existed for enacting a wasteful rivers and harbors bill—certainly a great question for a great committee to pass upon. That resolution went the way of the others, but served its purposes. He got his name in the papers.

On August 29 the gentleman offered another resolution asking the Judiciary Committee of the House to bring before it the officers and directors of the Atlantic & Gulf Coast Dredge Owners' Association to ascertain what efforts have been exerted to secure rivers and harbors legislation in the past. That resolution died, but answered its purpose.

Two days later he introduced another resolution asking the Judiciary Committee to investigate the general character of the Rivers and Harbors Congress and ascertain whether it is a first or second congress in its influence, and to report, as he says—

the exact nature of the constitutional obligations and duties of all individuals who are active officials in both congresses and who are attempting to serve both bodies in a dual capacity.

That resolution died but it answered its purpose.

On September 2, again on September 3, and again on September 17 he introduced resolutions along similar lines, calling for investigations, with like purposes and like results.

The gentleman is certainly easily satisfied and content with the mere introduction of resolutions, for none of them have been considered or reported on by the committees, and, I am advised, have never been insisted on by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. Speaker, it may be excusable for Representatives to mislead an unsuspecting public by the mere introduction of verbose resolutions filled with sensational charges and misrepresentations. In time the public will judge that the author of such resolutions is either playing them for idiots or has not sufficient influence to have his resolutions considered.

It may be justifiable in some instances for Representatives to extend their remarks in the RECORD in order that the public may get the benefit of their views. But there is no excuse or justification for a Member of this House to extend his remarks in the RECORD by directly or indirectly criticizing the public services or private actions of his colleagues.

And yet the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin, in order to catch the headlines of the sensational press, through the courtesies extended him by this House on June 3 to extend his remarks in the RECORD, saw fit to violate that courtesy, and made references to Members of this House and the other body as chief beneficiaries of this river and harbor legislation, and that they were influenced by certain special interests. That was the purport of his remarks.

I merely mention this to show how fair and open the gentleman is in his mad thirst for distinction and notoriety.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield five minutes more to the gentleman.



Mr. HARRISON. You may oppose the Ransdell-Humphreys bill, you may disagree with the authors of that bill in their fight for the waterways of this country, but you can never lessen the high regard and respect of those who know the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANDELL] and my colleague in this House [Mr. HUMPHREYS] for their faithful, splendid, and patriotic public services. [Applause.]

They have been here too long and have served their people too faithfully and are known by this body too well for one who has yet much to learn and little to forget to unjustly, through the extension of his remarks, criticize them. [Applause.]

Much has been said and written about the rivers and harbors bill being a "pork-barrel" bill. This is unfair to the improvements of the great waterways of this country. There are, no doubt, some items in the rivers and harbors bill that passed this House this year, as there are probably in every rivers and harbors bill that has passed Congress, that are not meritorious. But I do not believe there is any bill that passes this House that is better safeguarded than the rivers and harbors bill. What other bill is there that before an appropriation is made must first be recommended by experts?

It was the present Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] who is responsible for the emasculation of the present bill in the Senate, who caused the establishment of the present system. It was on his bill and his motion that the Board of Army Engineers for Rivers and Harbors was first created, and the law so written that appropriations be made only on their recommendation.

And I do not believe there is any branch of the public service so competent and efficient in their particular line of work and as free from outside influence as the Board of Army Engineers for Rivers and Harbors. They are men of the highest character and splendid qualifications for their work. [Applause.]

They hold their offices for life, and they are not personally interested in any of the projects they are called to pass upon. How could a bill be made up with less pork-barrel qualities in it than when it is made up on the recommendation of such an array of expert talent? The present bill as it left the House was made up of items on the recommendation of the Army board.

And yet, because my people and my district are so fortunate as to be favored by nature with harbors and rivers that need to be improved and maintained, and because, forsooth, the Board of Army Engineers should recommend their improvement that the people of all the country might increase their commerce and trade with foreign nations, and when I insist upon the improvements so recommended by that board, I am to be accused of trying to get pork and my district penalized. It is but natural and right that Congressmen and Senators who represent districts blessed with rivers and harbors should see that the Federal Government make reasonable appropriations for their improvement and maintenance.

Because one Representative might obtain a larger appropriation than another in the rivers and harbors bill is no reason why he should be criticized. Appropriations are made in most instances as they ought to be, according to the necessities and demands of the district, without respect to the Congressman who represents that district.

Why is it that when a Member here obtains an appropriation for some worthy project for the District of Columbia he is not styled a "pork-barrel Congressman"? Ah, sirs, it is because it is an appropriation not for his immediate constituents. But when one represents faithfully those who send him here and he obtains for them their proper recognition, then he must be criticized.

There is little "pork" in this bill; and I want to say to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] and those others who may style the rivers and harbors bill as the "pork-barrel measure," that the accusation would just as well lie against many other bills that are brought in here, notably the pension bill. None of that appropriation goes into my section; but I would be unworthy of the commission I hold if I should refuse to vote for a just pension bill. I believe the men who fought to preserve the Union ought to have reasonable pensions if they are in need of them; but I want to say to the gentleman that because you have many of them in your district and I have none in mine, and when you may fight for them I might say that that was "pork" as much as you can say, because in the rivers and harbors bill I have a provision for my rivers and for my harbors, that that is "pork."

Why, sirs, when the gentleman from Wisconsin says that we are trying to waste the people's money in this bill and are pork-barrel statesmen, I commend to his consideration the fact that no Member of this House has shown more zeal and activity in

trying to take money from the Public Treasury for his own district than he. Not content with his constituents abiding by the general pension laws and proving their claims for pensions under its provisions, why, I notice that during his short service here he has introduced 18 special private pension bills for his constituents, ranging in amounts from \$12 to \$30 a month. [Applause.]

If the gentleman had some rivers and harbors in his district, certainly at that rate he would soon be styled the champion pork-barrel statesman in Congress.

But that is not all. I notice that for the little town of Rice Lake, in his district, where 3,968 people live, he has introduced a bill to take from the Federal Treasury \$75,000 to erect a public building there. [Applause.] And, again, I notice that in the little town of Hudson, in his district, where only 2,810 people live, he has introduced a bill to erect at the Government's expense a post office to cost \$75,000. [Applause.]

Ah, sirs, the gentleman in his display for economy blows hot and cold. It is a case of whose ox is gored.

It comes with poor grace for the gentleman from Wisconsin to fight pork in the rivers and harbors bill when he is trying to get all he can out of the public-buildings bill and for pensions for his constituents.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Speaker, may I ask to whom the gentleman is referring?

Mr. HARRISON. To the gentleman who has just taken his seat, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR].

Now, Mr. Speaker, one other thought and I am through. I notice that the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] recently gave out this statement to the press; I will read it:

Representative TREADWAY, of Massachusetts, a Republican member of the committee, suggested the advisability of a still further cut in the appropriation, making it \$5,000,000. He said climatic conditions were such that very little work could be done in the North, and declared that such meritorious projects as the Boston Channel and New York Harbor could not be benefited by the small appropriation. The entire expenditure, he said, would probably be made in the South. He will fight the bill on the floor of the House.

I can not believe that the gentleman from Massachusetts, whom I admire and whose judgment I respect, who is always fair and broad-minded, could have made such a statement.

Surely he would not measure legislative action for the waterways of this country by geographical lines or length of seasons. That would be too unlike the gentleman. This Congress certainly has shown no partiality to the South, and if because we can work better in the winter on our rivers and harbors than they can in Maine, Massachusetts, or Washington, then that ought to appeal to the gentleman's high sense of justice and be a matter of felicitation to him rather than sorrow. If we adopt this article as the gentleman's view. Under the same rule of reasoning, if the gentleman's section had perpetual winter and we had perpetual summer, he would not then, of course, be in favor of any rivers and harbors legislation.

I hope the gentleman has been misquoted and that this apparent feeling of partisanship or sectionalism is not true.

I recently voted, and did it with pleasure, for an appropriation for the fire sufferers of Salem, in the gentleman's own State. I voted for two Members from his State to go on the great Committee on Rivers and Harbors, the gentleman and his colleague [Mr. MURRAY], and in this connection, Mr. Speaker, I want to say, since my good friend and colleague [Mr. MURRAY] retires from this great committee and Congress to-morrow to take up a high office in the city of Boston, that we all regret to see him leave. No man has ever retired from this House that I hold in higher esteem and friendship than BILL MURRAY. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, with only one exception, and that one Pennsylvania, your State of Massachusetts is the only State of the Union that has two men on that committee. Has the South played sectionalism or partisanship with your section? I say no; and the gentleman knows that we have not, and I hope that he will join in for the immediate passage of this bill that will mean so much for the improvement of the waterways of this section and to the people of every part of this country. [Loud applause.]

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] consume some of his time now?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 66, line 16, strike out the word "existing."

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I desire first to speak to the amendment which I have offered. My colleague [Mr. GALLIVAN], the new Member from Boston, who now has the task of solely representing that great city in this body—I am glad to say with skill, ability, and capacity [applause on the Democratic side]—has referred in his remarks to the possibility of this amendment being offered. It is offered to protect the interests of the second greatest shipping port in our great land.

We have in Boston Harbor to-day a channel of 35 feet in depth, and all the interests in New England have been especially anxious that that project should be continued and made 40 feet in depth rather than 35 feet. The gentleman representing part of the city of Boston, or, as I say, all of it here to-day, has explained some of the reasons why that should be continued; and if there is any money to be expended on river and harbor work during the next six months, it seems to me that the great ports of the cities of Boston and New York ought to be first considered.

The mayor of the city of New York and many of the leading citizens of that city appeared before our committee urging to be done in New York Harbor work that, if not now done, would seriously interfere with some of their local projects. The gentleman from New York [Mr. GOULDEN] introduced a bill which had the support of the entire New York City delegation, and which was adopted by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. In constructing the new and direct rapid-transit tube from Brooklyn to the city hall, New York, it is necessary to remove Coenties Reef, and this is certainly an urgent need of the great city of New York.

Consequently it seems to me no more than right and fair that the word "existing" should be stricken out of the amendment which we are considering here to-day, in order that such great works as the two to which I have referred can be undertaken at this time.

I regret to be obliged to differ from the members of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, with whom I have had such pleasant associations during the present session and for whom I have such high personal regard; nor am I able to submit to the will of the majority of the committee and accept the vote they passed in favor of reporting the Senate amendment.

Returning to a consideration of the bill under discussion, I am very glad, indeed, that my good friend from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] was kind enough to read a statement purporting to have come from me. I do not deny it; and I am glad that I have opportunity to admit that I made very nearly the statement which he read to this House, because it seems to me that he, when he talks about the beauties of the southern winters and the rigors of the northern winters, shows very clearly the justification of the statement that I made. This is absolutely true: That outside of a very small amount of money which will be used for maintenance of existing projects every dollar additional must be expended in the South. I am not a sectionalist. I will take credit of being what he says—a little broader than a sectional man. But reference has been made here on this floor during this debate to sectionalism and partisanship. It is mighty nice, gentlemen, not to talk these things openly, just because you have the power to enforce them with your votes over our heads. Time and again votes have been passed during this session greatly to the advantage of the Southern States. We on this side will not talk of sectionalism or partisanship when we have the same chances that you gentlemen on that side of the aisle now have, but we have not got them at this time nor have we the same chance in this bill.

Mr. DONOHUE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I am sorry I can not yield; but my time is very limited and, of course, a member of the committee can get time. The gentleman also says that we have been very well treated in the existing bill. I do not know just what he means by that, but I have taken occasion to look up what the original bill was. I suppose he was referring to the bill as it passed the House, not the bill under discussion here to-day. I have taken occasion to look up the difference between the appropriations made for the North and for the South, and I find that, including in the northern items the appropriations for the Ohio River—which are over \$5,000,000—in the North, with all the great amount of commerce in the cities of New York, Boston, Philadelphia, San Francisco, Seattle, and so on, and with all the great commerce on the Lakes carried in the bill as it passed the House, we had \$19,000,000, whereas our southern friends had in that bill \$23,000,000. As I say, the \$19,000,

000 included \$5,000,000 for the Ohio River, as the following computation of the appropriations carried in the bill will show:

Amounts appropriated.

NORTH.	
California	\$1,029,500
Connecticut	312,700
Delaware	1,486,000
District of Columbia	95,000
Indiana	83,600
Illinois	58,170
Kansas	10,000
Maine	218,000
Massachusetts	273,000
Michigan	511,280
Minnesota (includes sums for several States—Mississippi River improvement)	218,750
New Jersey	1,309,800
New York	2,624,875
Ohio	3,136,400
Oregon	2,240,175
Pennsylvania	1,186,800
Vermont	2,000
Washington	208,300
Wisconsin	260,400
Total North	19,264,850
SOUTH.	
Alabama	1,795,500
Arkansas	431,350
Florida	882,200
Georgia	456,250
Louisiana	244,500
Maryland	135,500
Mississippi (includes sums for several States—Mississippi River improvement)	9,500,000
Mississippi	655,000
Missouri	2,336,500
North Carolina	910,075
South Carolina	561,000
Tennessee	1,140,000
Texas	3,730,000
Virginia	977,784
West Virginia	25,000
Total South	23,780,659
Total North	19,264,850
South over North	4,380,309

So that while we may have been as fairly treated as our proportionate votes here on the floor—

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I will yield to the chairman of the committee, surely.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I will not ask it, because I know the gentleman's time is limited.

Mr. TREADWAY. Now, I do not care to deal with the phase of the question very extensively, but I do want to call attention to the fact that the bill which we have under consideration here to-day is not the bill that is being supported by the gentlemen who have talked in its behalf. Our very able chairman [Mr. SPARKMAN] said, in effect, that the lump-sum appropriation abrogates the legislative function of this body. The distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL] admitted in the very beginning of his remarks that this bill was bad legislation. He used those very words. Now, I for one do not intend to be shackled by any threat from any other branch of our Government that if we do not pass this legislation we can not get any bill at all. [Applause.] How do we know that? Let us pass a good bill. Let us pass a bill that is based on reason and common sense, and then, if some other body does not see fit to accept it, all well and good—the blame is not on us.

After this bill had been under consideration for months in another branch, one day an amendment was voted down, and a little later some other gentleman made the same identical proposition in order, as the RECORD shows, to avoid a night session and keeping the Members up all night. I can not believe that such a bill as that is the only kind of a bill that one of the greatest legislative bodies in the world will consider and pass. I will not agree that we must accept the bill as it has come from the Senate or not have any bill. As conditions now are, after the long lapse of time since the House passed the original bill on March 26, and in view of the fact that winter is coming on, I heartily agree to the amendment proposed by the ranking Republican member of the committee, which provides that the bill should be absolutely limited in its amount to maintenance and prevention of waste. What logic is there in coming here one day and saying that the Treasury is getting bankrupt, and that we must reach down into the pockets of the people and provide the Treasury with \$105,000,000 more revenue to prevent going bankrupt and not being able to pay our bills—what kind of logic is there, I say, when we take that step and the very next day or two after pass the next appropriation measure that comes up including \$15,000,000 more than is required?



If that is Democratic logic, I am glad I am something of a partisan to-day, and that I shall vote for the partisan amendment—call it so, if you please—proposed by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY]. I am not willing to go before the people of my district and tell them that I was one of those who voted \$15,000,000 out of the Treasury of our Government when the President himself says that we are in need of new forms of revenue. I want to call attention to one phrase in the Senate amendment which it does not seem to me has received very much consideration; that is in the lines omitted in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY]:

For the prosecution of such projects, heretofore authorized, as may be most desirable in the interest of commerce and navigation and most economical and advantageous in the execution of the work.

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] says that I show sectionalism when I do not accept that kind of a phrase. Here it is the first of October. It will be the first of November before any work can be done under this bill if it is passed. Still the gentleman thinks that we of the North ought to stand for that kind of a phrase being adopted by this Congress, when it is practically impossible to do any of the desired kind of work in the northern section of our country during the period which will intervene between now and the time another measure can be prepared. It is therefore perfectly evident that, excepting the item of maintenance, every dollar of this money will be expended in the South. I was very glad to vote for the original bill. I have no apologies for so voting. I, as a member of the committee, scrutinized very carefully the items with which I was most familiar, namely, those in New England and possibly in New York. As I knew that those were worthy projects, I was perfectly willing to rely upon the judgment of the chairman and of my colleagues on the committee that the items wherein they were especially interested were likewise worthy projects. But since that time there has come a large volume of criticism of that bill, and certain projects have been shown to be not as worthy as others. I do not think it is very becoming of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] to devote four-fifths of his speech to criticizing the Member of the House who may have been more responsible than any other one man for uniting public opinion and fixing public thought on those extravagances.

A very serious objection to the bill before this House is the fact that the appropriation is to be made in a "lump sum." As the chairman of the committee has stated, we abrogate our legislative functions and turn them over to the Board of Engineers. This board was severely criticized during the debate in the Senate, but notwithstanding this, either from haste in preparation of the final bill or not being able to agree upon projects for which the particular amount was to be expended, the lump sum was voted and is before us to-day. No pretense of an effort is made to allot this amount upon any equitable basis or in accordance with the merits of the various projects. We can easily see the wild scramble among influential Democrats to be the first ones to reach the office of the engineers after this bill passes. The precedent about to be established will surely be a source of trouble in the future. A far better plan is to provide for maintenance only at this time, and next winter prepare a bill that will adequately care for the necessary river and harbor improvements.

Let us not pass this bill to-day. Let us pass the substitute offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY], and then see whether or not the other branch of Congress will accept a fair, a reasonable, and an economical measure rather than insist, as some Members on the floor have stated, that unless we take their bill there will be no bill at all. [Applause.]

**THE SPEAKER.** The time of the gentleman has expired.

**Mr. HUMPHREY** of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE].

**THE SPEAKER.** The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] is recognized for 10 minutes. [Applause on the Republican side.]

**Mr. PAYNE.** Mr. Speaker, the State of New York is as much interested in river and harbor improvements as any State in the Union, and I think I am putting it very modestly when I say that. It pays 20 per cent of the bills for all the river and harbor improvements in the country, as estimated by experts who have given the matter attention. Of course, no one knows the exact proportion of the taxes that come from the people of any State, but about 20 per cent come from the State of New York. We have in New York real rivers that do not stand in need of any artificial irrigation, and real harbors where there is commerce.

There is one improvement in the State of New York, in the East River, that should appeal to every man interested in commerce. I understand that the initiation of that improvement was provided for in the original bill. We have an improvement in the upper Hudson River made necessary and essential for the full benefit of the people of the West of the \$102,000,000 improvement that we are putting on the Erie Canal. The Erie Canal runs through my district from one end to the other, and branches of it run out into nearly every part of the district, connecting some of the inland lakes with the navigation of the canal. So that my people are interested in the improvement of the terminal of this great waterway.

But when I enlist for economy in expenditures of the National Government I am willing to forego for the time being the improvement that my constituents are interested in, uniting for the general good. I want to do everything I can to remove the shadow of an excuse for any part of the unjust and odorous and burdensome taxation that you are proposing now to put upon the people of this country. [Applause on the Republican side.] You can do it by economical administration. I have in my hand the daily report of the Treasury Department for the 26th of September, Saturday last. I find that for the portion of the fiscal year 1915 ending on the 26th of September the total ordinary disbursements, the net ordinary disbursements, after deducting the unexpended balance, was \$102,803,285.53. That is for this fiscal year 1915 up to date last Saturday from the 1st day of July.

I find in the next column the disbursements a year ago for the same period were \$183,317,254.87. In other words, the disbursements for this last three months exceed the disbursements of a year ago for the same period by \$9,583,030.66. [Applause on the Republican side.]

That is pretty near \$10,000,000, and it is safe to say it will be \$10,000,000 on the 30th day of this month. Ten million dollars for the first quarter in excess of expenditures! Do you see at what rate you are going—\$40,000,000 a year more than last year, without any river and harbor bill this year, and with a river and harbor bill last year? Where will the end come if you go on with this extravagance of expenditure and extravagance of appropriation?

I want to begin right here at home. I want to vote for the amendment of the gentleman from Washington cutting the bill down to \$5,000,000. I would like to see it become a law in that respect. It is more important that we relieve the people of this country from additional taxation than it is to run the risk of wasting this money on improvements that never ought to be undertaken, or, if they ought to be, can wait a little while until the commerce and business of the country catch up to the improvements already made. Cut this appropriation down; set an example to the Executive of this country. Let the President call his Cabinet together and take into careful consideration the question of how much they can lop off of the appropriations already made for the expenses of this year. A careful executive in each department, careful officials, can cut off a little here and a little there without crippling the service. Why should it not be done?

Oh, you gentlemen agonize about taking the "people's money" when you get out on the stump. You will have to cut that out of your speeches this fall. [Applause on the Republican side.] After having voted for this unjust, inexcusable tax bill of last week, how are you going to meet your constituents? I am holding out something for you to meet them with. Tell them that you cut down the appropriations, even if you did wait until the last moment on the last bill, and that you tried to do the best you could. Tell them that you set an example to the Executive whereby he might cut down something of this extravagant expenditure. Be something besides a rubber stamp here in Congress. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] Do not follow where you are led blindly, for fear you will fall into the ditch all together. Do your own thinking, have your own independence, have courage sufficient to carry to the other end of the Capitol, lest you lack the courage to get back home before election day and meet your constituents that will have to pay the bills.

Why should we not pass this amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington? Why should we not insist upon it? The Senate, you say, will not agree to it. They will if you stand firm. The Senate is no more than mortal. I know some of you think they are. You pass undigested legislation under a rule or a gag law, without consideration, without hearings from the opposition. It goes to the Senate, and they have debate. There are two parties in the Senate, and one does not override the other. I used to talk about the Senate rules and thought that they ought to have something whereby they could bring an end to debate; that we ought to have rules here where we could

do business. Well, when I see how our rules can be abused and how the rules in the Senate can be used to give a chance for debate and discussion; when I have seen improvements written on bill after bill that you have sent over there, coming back far from perfect, and yet how much better than when they left here, I can not but believe that the Senate rules are a good deal nearer right than the House rules are, especially under a Democratic Congress. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

You started out with the idea, and the Executive seems to share it, that this was a Democratic administration and that nobody but Democrats should have anything to say. You did not appreciate the good, honest criticism that might come to you from the other side. You thought everything was perfect when it was sent to you. [Applause on the Republican side.] You did not even have to think about it. You said, "Yes; I am for it," and voted that way. It would have been a great deal better if you had started out at the beginning of the extra session with an appreciation of the criticism made against your bill from a different viewpoint and weighed it carefully. You would have stood a good deal better now before the country than you do if you had done that, and you would have had better legislation, and you would have had better chances for your future salvation if you had done that. Gentlemen, vote once for economy. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I make that request for all gentlemen who speak on this bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent that all gentlemen who speak on this bill may be permitted to extend their remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, after the close of the discussion I may have no objection to that, but for the present I object.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DUPRÉ].

Mr. DUPRÉ. Mr. Speaker, when a highwayman meets you on the road and points a pistol at your head, and you are unarmed and defenseless, the only sane thing to do is to throw up your hands and surrender. That is the situation here in regard to this river and harbor bill. It has been the victim of a legislative holdup. Its friends are powerless to hit back, and there is nothing for us to do except to accept the Senate amendment. If there were any other course open with impunity, I would never vote for that Senate amendment, because I regard it as absolutely wrong in principle and utterly inadequate in amount. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SWITZER].

Mr. SWITZER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] criticizes the Senate amendment to the river and harbor bill for the reason that he says that in all likelihood a large amount of it will be expended on the improvement of the Mississippi River and other southern streams. Other gentlemen have risen and have objected to the bill because some of this money may be used in the building of levees on the Mississippi. I desire to call the attention of my Republican colleagues to a plank in the Republican national platform of 1912, which reads as follows:

The Mississippi River is the Nation's drainage ditch. Its flood waters, gathered from 31 States and the Dominion of Canada, constitute an overpowering force which breaks the levees and pours its torrents over many millions acres of the richest land in the Union, stopping mails, impeding commerce, and causing great loss of life and property. These floods are national in scope, and the disasters they produce seriously affect the general welfare. The States unaided can not cope with this giant problem. Hence we believe the Federal Government should assume a fair proportion of the burden of its control so as to prevent the disasters from recurring floods.

The Mississippi River is the only river that is mentioned in the Republican national platform, and now when it is likely that a considerable amount of money will be expended upon this project, which is indorsed by the Republican Party, some gentlemen want to squeal. I for one propose to take my medicine. I think that our platform, as a distinguished man

once said, means something, "that it is not molasses to catch flies, and that it means business." Objection has been made because some large amount of this money may be expended upon one of the single projects referred to in this Senate amendment. What is the objection to that? Has not every project referred to in the Senate amendment been passed upon by the Board of Engineers? Has it not been passed upon by this House, existing projects and those that are authorized? Do we not intend to prosecute each of these projects to completion at some future time? Are they not all worthy?

After the Senate had thrashed around for seven or eight months they cut out all of the new projects, but they did not cut out, as I understand it, a single one of the projects under construction and those already authorized. So they have the stamp of approval of the Senate. There is a certain estimate made for each one of these improvements, and the money will not be wasted if \$20,000,000 are expended on the Mississippi or if \$20,000,000 are expended on the Ohio River alone, although we do not anticipate there will be that much spent on the Ohio; only perhaps a million or two million dollars. But how could the money be wasted? The canalization of the Ohio River is estimated to cost about \$64,000,000. Of course, there can not be expended \$20,000,000 on the Ohio River during the next three or four winter months. But if it could be done there would be just that much less work to be performed on this project at some future time.

Some gentlemen talk as though these twenty million of dollars were to be expended in the next two or three or four months. I doubt whether very much of it will be expended then, but it will continue to be available through next spring and summer and fall. What objection is there to appropriating a lump sum for specified projects, all of which have been passed upon by the Board of Engineers? If we were making these appropriations for each specific project, we would be guided in the main by what the engineers say they can expend on this particular project for the next 2 or 3 or 10 months.

Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of the House to another proposition. It seems there is another plank in the Democratic national platform that is about to be shattered. If you will read their platform, long and voluminous, you will find that it says, in effect, that the Democratic Party is not going to take any backward step in river and harbor improvements the country over, and specifies the Mississippi River, and even the drainage of the lands in the Mississippi Delta.

But, Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of some gentlemen who have been criticizing this bill and who think that they have raised such a furor over the country that there will be no river and harbor appropriations in the future, I desire to say that on the 25th of August last, after this filibuster had been started against the river and harbor appropriation bill in the Senate, three political parties met in convention in the city of Columbus, Ohio. The Progressive Party declared that it favored "the speedy completion of the Ohio River improvement project." The Republican Party also met in convention on the 25th of August and it declared in favor of the river and harbor improvements, as follows:

We urge Congress to make liberal and regular appropriations to complete the improvement of the Ohio River.

The Democratic Party in convention assembled in Ohio kept silent upon this proposition, but there is a good reason, likely, for that. The Democratic Congress had repudiated one plank of their platform of 1912 and it had ignored many others and had failed to fulfill in many respects its pledges pertaining to its platform.

This Democratic Congress was still in session, and I take it the Democratic Party in convention in Columbus, not knowing what sort of an antic the Democratic Congress would cut next, kept silent, not only in reference to saying anything about the Ohio River, but never mentioned the Democratic national platform of 1912. But, regardless of this silence on the part of the Democrats of Ohio, I desire to say that I believe they are all in favor of the speedy completion of the canalization of the Ohio River. I know that the Democrats who live in the Ohio Valley are just as earnest and active in the movement to bring about these results as the Republican Members.

Now, I feel that if we can not get the whole loaf of \$43,000,000 we started out with in March, which I believe we ought to have, we ought to take the next thing to it, nearly a half a loaf. It is better sometimes to compromise. For instance, the work on numerous locks and dams in the Ohio River, some 15 or 20 now under process of construction or authorized to be commenced, on which I understand by the language of this bill this money can be used, would be greatly retarded if we failed to pass something like a \$20,000,000 appropriation. The



\$20,000,000, as I understand, will only about cover \$10,000,000 which will be expended on projects which are now being prosecuted by Government plants and about \$2,500,000 in the maintenance of existing river and harbor works, and \$7,500,000 to carry out the work under private contract. I regret, as much as the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] and the other gentlemen who have spoken, to abdicate my power as a legislator or as a member of the committee, but when the President appeared here on the 4th of September and personally notified us that a deficit stared him in the face in our revenues, that there was a possibility we might soon have an empty Treasury, and recommended the levying of a war tax in time of peace, that moment the river and harbor bill as it passed the House was doomed. I do not give the credit for the defeat of the river and harbor bill to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR]; I attribute it to the President of the United States and the failure of the Underwood tariff bill to produce sufficient revenues to meet the ordinary expenses of the Government.

Since the President's address on the 4th of September last there has been a great cry for economy on the part of Congress, and in response to this demand the Senate cut the House bill as amended by the Committee on Commerce of the Senate from \$53,683,004 to \$20,000,000. It seems to me that this is a sufficient retrenchment on the annual appropriation for rivers and harbors, and which is so badly needed for numerous projects upon which work is now being done.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HULL].

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, the question as to whether or not the river and harbor measure shall be defeated in its passage on account of the condition of the Treasury, due to war conditions, is one question, and the question as to whether this bill shall be defeated and blacklisted, as it were, upon the ground that it contains items without merit in such large numbers as to subject it to the charge of being a "pork-barrel" measure, in the offensive sense of that term, is another and entirely different question. Upon this latter proposition I desire to offer a few remarks, but before doing so I desire to say I was somewhat amused at the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], to which I wish to make a brief reference. As is his custom while purporting to discuss a nonpolitical subject, he drifted into political affairs. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] preaches to us a lecture on economy in connection with this particular class of legislation. If I were disposed to drift into politics as he has, I might reply to him by calling his attention to the fact that in 1896, when the Treasury was empty and when the Cleveland administration was being compelled to issue tens and hundreds of millions of dollars of bonds, a large river and harbor bill passed a Republican House, went to the President, was vetoed upon the ground—and the most urgent ground—of economy, and the gentlemen on the other side, disregarding every consideration of economy, then in control of the House, rose in their might and passed that bill over his veto.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL. I will.

Mr. McKELLAR. Did Mr. PAYNE vote for that bill over the President's veto at that time?

Mr. HULL. I have no desire to do the gentleman an injustice; I do not know.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It is safe to say the gentleman did.

Mr. HULL. I am advised that he did. In 1899, when the Spanish War emergency legislation was pending, the Republican side was in control of the House. Now, the emergency legislation, together with bond issues and the calculated increase in customs receipts, gave to the Treasury within one fiscal year about \$300,000,000 in additional taxes. During that first year, as I recall, the gentlemen in charge of the House voted between \$15,000,000 and \$16,000,000 of river and harbor appropriations. In 1899, \$23,000,000 for rivers and harbors, not to mention public buildings, were voted. We heard no suggestion of economy then except on the Democratic side. Now, without pursuing that subject further, I wish to say that the present administration during its brief existence has had many difficult and urgent questions to solve. In my judgment it has met and solved those that have been thus far disposed of in a manner most satisfactory to the American people, and I have no doubt that upon the question of public expenditures, when I view the Democratic record in all the States and in the General Government during former years, it will be but a very short time when the question of a system of sound and economical expenditures in the General Government will be worked out and put into operation by this administration. Upon the other question gentlemen have

referred to, if there be any gentleman who has been exploiting this bill for mere publicity, I could tell him how he could get much more publicity by exerting his efforts along another line. A few years ago a notable commission reported, as I recall—and I do not wish to be incorrect—that the magazines and other like publications were receiving some \$50,000,000 subsidy from the Government through the mail service. Now, if the same gentleman wants publicity, and is sincere about economy, he can get all the publicity he is looking for by attacking that proposition.

Mr. Speaker, as a Member of this House, I have always welcomed and urged the closest scrutiny of every item of appropriation, and do so now; but this haphazard, ignorant, careless, negligent criticism, for filibustering purposes, often does a serious injustice to an item in an important bill. I now have in mind one relating to the Cumberland River. The gentleman who now belongs to another body, but who was at one time chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors in the House, recently engaged in a lengthy filibuster against this measure. During that time he referred to this particular river, the Cumberland, in the States of Kentucky and Tennessee—and I refer to it because I happen to have personal knowledge of the actual facts pertaining to the merits of that stream—the gentleman who made this lengthy filibuster and who uttered innumerable charges against this river, in most instances did not touch the important facts. He even went so far as to offer sweeping and damaging charges and reflections against the Department of Engineers, notwithstanding he had been their champion in this House almost for 15 years, notwithstanding he was the author of the provision creating the Board of Engineers, and has stood on this floor year after year and defended them for their fairness, their efficiency, the accuracy of their judgment, and their ability as engineers. Yet, when he comes to a river in the course of this filibuster and he seeks to destroy a project and is unable to find sufficient facts on which to base even a reasonable charge, he turns his attention to the engineers and grossly reflects upon the fairness and freedom from bias of those gentlemen. He even imputes to them such weakness as to render them subject to undue influence on the part of Members of Congress. He even charged, or strongly intimated, that the Department of Engineers had reported that a certain section of the upper Cumberland River was not worthy of improvement "at the present time," and that within 14 months, through congressional influence, they reversed that opinion and made a favorable report. He goes further than that and strongly hints they did this without any further direction, either from Congress or from the Rivers and Harbors Committee.

Now, all these statements or intimations are absolutely untrue. I can not think that the gentleman had any particular intention of assassinating, as it were, a meritorious river proposition, but for filibustering purposes during his enthusiasm he became seized with such a spirit of recklessness that he was ready to go to such extremes and lengths as to attempt to injure in a measure the reputation that these splendid engineers have built up by a lifetime of honest, earnest work in their department. I want to say that I have been coming in contact with those gentlemen for many years, and while I have often been overruled in my contentions and have often been almost provoked by adverse rulings, I can say in all candor that I have not appeared before any court in my State or section that was harder to move on a question of fact than the Department of Engineers have been difficult to move on what I considered a highly meritorious state of facts in support of a waterway improvement. The truth as to the favorable report in this case is that only three Congressmen and two business men were present in December, 1912, when the discovery of double the amount of reported commerce changed the attitude of the board.

Now, this illustrates, Mr. Speaker, in a striking manner the rank injustice that is done by indiscriminate criticism of items embraced in a comprehensive appropriation bill, such as the pending river and harbor bill. There is no more meritorious item in this bill than the upper Cumberland River. I would join with any gentleman who is anxious to practice economy in the light of our war conditions in putting this bill into conference and letting it go over until a later period [applause], but I do not propose to stand here and seemingly admit, if a majority of this House should adopt the pending Senate substitute resolution, that a single charge or a single statement derogatory to different items in this measure that were not based upon the facts—and most of them were not—should be taken as confessed. I think that it ought to be thoroughly agreed that if the House should adopt the Senate substitute amendment, it is without prejudice to these new projects and it is with the distinct understanding that there is no concession



as to the soundness or truthfulness of most of the charges that have been carelessly and recklessly and indiscriminately made against items in the pending House measure. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SWITZER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BALTZ. Mr. Speaker, I shall oppose the Senate amendment for the reason that if the rivers and harbors bill as passed by the House is a "pork-barrel" bill, then this Senate amendment is nothing more nor nothing less than a "pork-barrel" measure. I shall not go on record as supporting any measure that has any "pork" in it.

The item in the bill as passed by the House carrying an appropriation for that section of the Mississippi River that bounds the district which I have the honor to represent has no "pork" in it. The cities of Granite City and East St. Louis, two great industrial centers, are menaced by the Mississippi River in times of high water, and great damage has been done there in the past by the high waters. A few years of the destruction wrought by the Mississippi River would many times pay for this appropriation, and it would relieve in a great measure any future trouble of this nature. East St. Louis is a city of 80,000 people, and Granite and her sister cities add 30,000 more people that need this protection. These people have experienced the floods in the past, and I want to go on record for the appropriation carried in the bill passed by the House for that part of the Mississippi River touching my district as one of urgent need and necessity for the lives and property of the cities of East St. Louis and Granite City. Under the laws of the State of Illinois the people in this part of my district have expended \$6,500,000 for protection from the Mississippi River. They are now taxed to the limit, and it seems to me the Government should assist them in the meritorious work they have started for the saving of life and property from the Mississippi River during times of high water.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PARKER].

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 67, line 7, after the word "improvement," insert: "And provided further, That of the \$20,000,000 herein appropriated, \$750,000 shall be applied to the improvement of the Hudson River by continuing the construction of the lock and dam at Troy, N. Y."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Speaker, I assume that this conference report will be adopted, but out of fairness to the State of New York I ask that you accept the amendment that I have just proposed, because upon the completion of the improvements of the Hudson River at Troy depends the efficiency of the Barge Canal, which is being built at an expense of \$201,000,000, which enormous sum is being raised by the taxpayers of the State of New York without one cent of Government aid.

It is a well-known fact that the barges from the Erie Canal and the Champlain Canal will be unable to proceed down the Hudson River unless the work of constructing the dam at Troy and deepening the channel below is completed, and completed simultaneously with those two great projects. You are appropriating \$20,000,000 for river and harbor improvements to be left entirely to the discretion of the engineers, with no guaranty or recommendation that any particular improvement or work be continued. In answer to my question, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN], chairman of the committee, said that he presumed that the work at Troy would be continued.

All that I ask you to do is to insert a provision in this bill that will make it mandatory for that work to be continued. It seems to me eminently unfair to the great State of New York, that must pay at least 20 per cent of the \$20,000,000, that it should be left in any doubt regarding the continuance of this

work, which is absolutely essential to the carrying out of the canal scheme. The gentleman asks why the State of New York does not do this work itself, and let me say in answer that he must know that the Hudson River at that point is a navigable stream; therefore it is entirely under the jurisdiction of the United States Government. We of the State of New York are as powerless to help ourselves as though this project was located in the center of the Atlantic Ocean.

Again I appeal to you in all fairness to allow this amendment to pass, not as a matter of charity or as a matter of showing your good will toward the State of New York, but simply and solely as a matter of common justice, to insure the completion of one of the greatest projects of modern times, and not leave the completion of this project to the whims and caprices of any board of engineers, regardless of how able they may be.

Mr. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PARKER. I will.

Mr. WILSON of Florida. On what do you predicate your figures of \$750,000?

Mr. PARKER. On the item in the original copy of the bill.

Mr. WILSON of Florida. The House bill?

Mr. PARKER. The House bill. And I think the item was made up by the Engineers. The work on the dam is now going on. There is no question but that the Government intends to complete the work.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOULDEN].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. GOULDEN] is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. GOULDEN. Mr. Speaker, some minutes since I had hoped to have 10 minutes or more in which to speak about the merits of this proposition that has come over from the Senate, but pressure for time by the Members has impelled me to take less and to curtail my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, the Members of the House have heard something to-day of the splendid waterways meeting held in New York last week, so ably presided over by our colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE], and which has done so much for the improvement of the Nation's navigable waters.

I had the privilege of attending its first day's session and of hearing the able young mayor of New York City, Mr. John Purroy Mitchel, in his cordial address of welcome, plead for the needs of that great port.

He spoke strongly in favor of all the improvements appropriated for in this bill as it passed the House, but especially of the East River project, which I had the honor of fathering in this Congress. This stream, which carries annually 45,000,000 tons, and for which my bill had an item of \$500,000 to remove some rocks, and especially those at Coenties and Corlears Reefs.

The first named lies directly over a proposed tunnel about to be built by the city in the extension of its great passenger traffic system.

Until these rocks are removed nothing can be done and the project is held up. Immediate action should be had by the Government, first to improve this important and useful river; secondly, to enable the city authorities to proceed with its necessary rapid-transit plans. The arguments of Mayor Mitchel should be heeded. The Hudson and Harlem Rivers, two navigable streams, carrying 72,000,000 and 15,000,000 tons, respectively, each year, will be in danger of being cut out by the adoption of the conference report. The State of New York last year agreed to appropriate \$1,000,000 to secure the right of way for a much-needed improvement in the last-named stream at Johnston's Iron Works. The port of New York badly needs the completion of such important waterways as the Bronx River and Westchester and Eastchester Creeks, now under construction, and of the deepening and widening of the Bronx Kills, an improvement recommended by Gen. Newton in 1874, and several times since then by the Government engineers, all urging its importance and necessity.

I wish that it were possible to change this conference report and replace the measure as it passed this body in March last. That seems now to be out of the question, and to save something for those projects now under improvement I will reluctantly vote with the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors to accept \$20,000,000, especially in view of the loss of revenues on account of the war in Europe. I certainly would not do so if there was any other way out of the difficulty.

I hope the improvements now under construction in and around the port of New York will share in the amount carried in the amended bill, and that the Government engineers will see that these are continued during this fiscal year, as they so richly deserve. [Applause.]



Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion there is no question whatever that every Representative from a northern district voting for this extravagant \$20,000,000 proposition will retract and apologize before election on November 3 next. There is at the present time, or was on June 30 last, \$45,338,000 available for river and harbor improvements, of which \$27,872,000 was assigned to certain uncompleted contracts, leaving an unexpended balance available for all river and harbor work on certain designated projects of \$18,288,000. That report, from the Secretary of War, is as late as August 3 of this year.

You can not beguile the people in the passage of this added appropriation of \$20,000,000 with the idea that it is simply for the maintenance of projects. Scan this report from the Secretary of War and you will see that innumerable projects in every district in the country have available balances for continuing the work, and that in each district there are amounts totaling from \$200,000 to \$500,000 and more, the average being about \$400,000 for each engineering district; and here you are trying to justify the burden that last week you placed upon the people by claiming that one-fifth of the tax levy is for maintenance work of rivers and harbors, when there is at present from last year's river and harbor act and prior bills ample funds for not only maintenance but \$18,000,000 for continuing improvement on various projects.

Why, so violent is the protest in the Northern States against the added burden that you cast upon the people last week that the Democrats in their county convention at Madison, Wis., protested against the war-revenue tax as unjustified and unwarranted. [Applause on the Republican side.] And yet, in the face of these protests from all quarters, you are going ahead and loading them down still more with this added appropriation of \$20,000,000.

Cut down that \$20,000,000; save the taxpayers their rightful money. Do not levy taxes upon them until the burden becomes so great that they can not bear it. Why, even the Missouri River—and I call this to the attention of my genial friend from Kansas City [Mr. BORLAND]—had \$850,000 available on June 30 for improvement from Kansas City to the mouth of the river. The Galveston district had \$600,000 available. The Mississippi River improvement, from the Ohio to the Missouri, had \$300,000 available. The Mississippi River to Leach River, Minn., had over \$100,000 available. And so on throughout the entire report—on every main project ample funds for continuing the work.

I favor river and harbor bills, but when this bill was under consideration in the House I joined with my colleague [Mr. FREAR] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CALLAWAY] in opposing those projects which even the War Department, I believe, will not authorize, among them that unjustified inter-coastal canal scheme, which will involve this Government in an expenditure of \$100,000,000.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I can not yield, because my time is limited. I opposed that scheme because it is chimerical.

I say to the gentlemen of this House that while I favor river and harbor improvements, I do not believe that any business concern would favor bonding or mortgaging their property in order to go ahead with some new project, and that is what the Senate amendment provides. No pressing need exists for this work. In fact, this and the last Congress has been appropriating so much money for this work that the department has not been able to spend it as fast as it is appropriated. The surplus of eighteen millions at the beginning of this fiscal year is proof of your extravagance, and with this large surplus you have the temerity to demand another twenty million. The substitute offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] strikes out all authorization for the prosecution of work on existing projects and limits the amount to maintenance, which can be justified. But no man can justify in these times—these pressing times—the expenditure of such a large amount as one-fifth of what you intend to levy in your war revenue tax bill for improvements that can without injury to projects or commerce be postponed. I call upon you Democrats who wish to be consistent to show your consistency in favor of economy now. There is \$18,000,000 available for river and harbor improvement work at the present time. Five millions will be ample, added to that \$18,000,000, to tide over existing conditions, until we can see whether the revenues will warrant further expenditures. Place the country above your partisan in-

fluences in favor of local projects. Look at this from the standpoint of what is best for the country as a whole, and do not show that you are in favor of extravagance when the country demands you to be economical in the extreme. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POW). The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON] such time as he desires.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the district which I have the honor to represent has nearly a thousand miles of shore line, and probably it has more navigable rivers than any other district in the United States. In the House rivers and harbors bill as finally perfected there were eight projects for that district and two surveys, to say nothing of the interest of my district in certain of the Columbia River projects. All of those items went into this bill strictly on their merits to such an extent that in the hearings it was not necessary to make a statement of more than a few words concerning them. Two projects had to await the arrival of certain papers. The bill was held open for the printed report on the Willapa Harbor report, and no verbal report was necessary. The Grays Harbor maintenance item was forced to await the arrival of the district engineer's estimate and recommendations, and statements that these were here are not true. The Grays Harbor item was added in the Senate on the recommendations of the board, just as I was assured it would be. I was told by the committee that detailed statements were not wanted, and I was asked to write statements for one of the committeemen and the clerk, which I did.

I mention these matters, Mr. Speaker, because out in my district a few disgruntled spirits and disappointed office seekers are still howling over my handling of these items, in spite of the fact that all were settled properly on their merits and were in the bill up to the day the Senate abandoned the whole thing. No one of them could have handled a single item differently.

As a matter of fact, I was most fortunate to have eight worthy and meritorious projects in the bill. Of the eight, three were new projects, namely: Willapa Harbor, Columbia River at Cathlamet, and Skamokawa River. Under the Senate's lump-sum scheme, which the House is now asked to indorse, these three items must wait until another rivers and harbors bill is written. But, Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as we can not have a perfect bill, and inasmuch as the presentation to the Rivers and Harbors Board of Engineers of \$20,000,000 in a lump sum, to be expended as that board sees fit, will cause the board to be damned in the long run, no matter how well it expends that money, I am in favor of the substitute which provides \$5,000,000, which is enough to fully provide for the maintenance and upkeep of all the established projects mentioned in the amended rivers and harbors bill. Under that sum five of the eight projects in southwest Washington should be cared for. I quote from pages 41 and 42 of the comparative print of H. R. 13811:

Improving Grays Harbor and bar entrance, Washington: For maintenance, \$110,000.

Improving Grays Harbor and Chehalis River, Wash.: For maintenance of improvement of inner portion of Grays Harbor and of Chehalis River up to Montesano, \$30,000.

Improving Cowlitz and Lewis Rivers, Wash.: Continuing improvement and for maintenance, including North and East Forks of Lewis River, \$10,000.

Improving Grays River, Wash.: For maintenance, \$500.

Improving Puget Sound, Wash.: For maintenance of improvement of Puget Sound and its tributary waters, \$25,000.

As I said a moment ago, my district loses the new projects—Willapa, Cathlamet, and Skamokawa. Mr. Speaker, in the campaign against me at home I am being roundly criticized by what is called my inactivity and want of knowledge in regard to the southwestern Washington items in the rivers and harbors bill. Inasmuch as eight items and two surveys were placed in the bill on merit, and as five of them are in a position to be cared for under any bill that can be passed, I feel that such criticism is not only unwarranted but extremely unjust. Those who are making such charges are not familiar with the real situation and are taking advantage of the fact that I can not be at home to answer them. These same critics will now charge, without the slightest warrant, that I am sacrificing Willapa, Cathlamet, and Skamokawa. I think, however, that all can see that even with \$20,000,000 these three, being new projects, can not be included in the grand grab that is about to begin.

A portion of southwestern Washington lies on the Columbia River, and it will be interesting to citizens there to know that under the \$5,000,000 substitute the maintenance of the lower Columbia, the Columbia at Celilo Falls, and repairs and maintenance at the mouth of the Columbia would all be cared for.



As fares the district which I represent, so fare all of the other congressional districts. Then, why, Mr. Speaker, should this House turn loose an extra \$15,000,000 to be scrambled for at a time when the majority has just declared that a special direct tax is necessary; at a time when the entire South is clamoring that the Government must help take care of its cotton crop; at a time when the far West is feeling the pinch?

Mr. Speaker, up to this moment during my term in Congress I have not given expression to a single calamity howl, although I have long known that things were going from bad to worse in the Northwest. I had hoped the situation would change. But, Mr. Speaker, in my own district, only last week, five banks closed their doors.

You gentlemen of the South are feeling badly over the cotton situation. You are attending meetings which are being held right here in Washington, D. C., which declare that the Government must buy cotton or give first aid to the banks that will hold warehouse receipts for the cotton. O my friends, the situation is just as bad in the logging industry in the Northwest. Bankers, merchants, millmen, and workingmen know it. I do not care for the political situation; neither do I care what is any man's politics now, when it comes to taking out of the Treasury and placing with the Army Board of Engineers a lump sum of \$20,000,000 to spend as it pleases, and which sum the board, I am very sure, from interviews I have had, prefers not to receive.

Mr. Speaker, if owing to circumstances over which we have no control we can not have the perfected bill that was laid down here by a competent committee, that knew what it was doing, we are in poor business to throw out a \$20,000,000 lump sum to the Board of Engineers simply because the majority of the Senate will have it that way. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KREIDER].

Mr. KREIDER. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the discussions of this bill and want to say that I have no doubt many improvements could and should be made in the rivers and harbors of the United States, and I am not opposed to such necessary and reasonable improvements, but unfortunately our Democratic friends have been appropriating money and continued to appropriate money until we find that the entire probable income of the Government is entirely insufficient to cover the extravagant appropriations already made, and as a result only last Friday the Democratic Party passed the so-called war-tax revenue bill in this House, which, if passed by the Senate and signed by the President, will lay added unnecessary and grievous burdens on the people, and for no other reason than to provide money for these reckless appropriations.

The Democratic Party has been preaching economy through its platform, through its press, and from the stump, and yet, when they come into power, the appropriations of a Democratic Congress exceed those of the most extravagant Republican Congress by over \$100,000,000.

I repeat what I said last week when the Democratic war-revenue bill was before this House and was passed by a "gag" rule, limiting debate and cutting off all amendments, that if the President had called the heads of the departments together and asked them to at least make some pretense of practicing economy, which the Democratic Party has been preaching for many, many years, instead of calling the two Houses of Congress together and asking them to place extra taxes on the people, it would have been a great deal better and more consistent with Democratic pretenses.

I commend the action of the Senate, which was brought about by the Republican Members of that body, in cutting the appropriations of \$53,000,000, which this bill carries with its amendments, to \$20,000,000; and if this House will now adopt the amendment offered by the ranking minority member of the committee, Mr. HUMPHREY, and cut this \$20,000,000 to \$5,000,000, which is ample to maintain and preserve existing improvements, it will be at least one honest effort to economize and will be an example which, if it had been followed by the Democrats months ago, would have obviated the need of additional taxes.

In my speech last week I also called attention to the fact that if the Democratic Party had managed the affairs of the Nation on the same economical lines that the Republicans did the balance on hand would have been in excess of \$51,000,000 on July 30, 1914, the end of the fiscal year. With this balance on hand and the extra income from the income tax there would have been a sufficient balance that, even if the Democratic Underwood tariff bill fails to produce the revenue, because of the foreign war, there would have been no need of extra taxation. But, unfortunately, these \$51,000,000 have been expended, and the balance in the Treasury, which was over \$149,000,000

when President Wilson was inaugurated on March 4, 1913 is now less than \$115,000,000, showing a decrease of \$34,000,000. Notwithstanding these facts, you seem to be determined to keep on appropriating money, regardless of income, and then you pretend to blame the deficit on the European war, when, as a matter of fact, your extra appropriations, which have broken the record, amount to as much as you propose to levy by this war-tax bill which you have just passed; and I want to go on record here and now and say that if you do not stop these reckless appropriations the tax bill you have just passed, even though it will produce \$150,000,000 instead of the \$105,000,000 you estimate, will be insufficient, and more taxes must be levied before your term of office expires.

When I advocate this cutting out of appropriations, I only advocate that which is practiced by every successful business man and corporation. I need not call your attention to the savings which the railroads of the country have been obliged to make, nor those of other large corporations and the business men and, for that matter, the private citizen; when the revenues are decreased, the sensible thing to do, the proper thing to do, is to cut out unnecessary expenses.

And, furthermore, I am only advocating the course that has always been followed by the Republican Party when they were in control. For instance, when the Spanish War was going on, in 1898, the Republicans passed a war-revenue bill; but did they then turn around and appropriate \$20,000,000 for river and harbor improvements? No; they did not pass any river and harbor bill at all in 1898, during the continuance of the war, but in 1899 they passed a very modest river and harbor bill, which carried an appropriation of \$16,000,000, with no river and harbor bill at all the year before; and for this modest appropriation what did our Democratic friends say? I will quote from the Democratic platform of 1900:

We denounce the lavish appropriations of recent Republican Congresses, which have kept taxes high and which threaten the perpetuation of the present war levies. We favor the reduction and speedy repeal of the war taxes and a return to the time-honored Democratic policy of strict economy in governmental expenditures.

Mr. Speaker, the Republicans passed no river and harbor bill during the Fifty-sixth Congress; the next river and harbor bill after 1899 was passed in 1902. Three years passed by without the passage of a river and harbor bill, and it seems the country was not suffering anywhere because of river and harbor improvements. To repeat, in 1898 we made no appropriation; in 1899 we appropriated \$16,000,000; in 1900, nothing; in 1901, nothing; in 1902 we appropriated \$26,000,000, and we had made no further appropriations up to the time the Democratic convention met in 1904, and then what does the Democratic platform say?

Large reductions can easily be made in the annual expenditures of the Government without impairing the efficiency of any branch of the public service, and we shall insist upon the strictest economy and frugality compatible with vigorous and efficient civil, military, naval administration as a right of the people too clear to be denied or withheld.

Is it any surprise that the people of the country are dumfounded at these extravagant appropriations in the face of these declarations of economy contained in the Democratic platforms? Is it any surprise that the people of the country are beginning to regard the Democratic platform as a joke?

Think of it! A Democratic national convention said that \$16,000,000 in two years was gross extravagance; that \$23,000,000 in four years was a wanton expenditure, and now, last year, this Democratic Congress appropriated \$41,000,000, almost as much as the Republican Congress had appropriated in six years, and this House had passed another bill appropriating, with amendments, \$53,000,000, but which has been cut to \$20,000,000 by the Senate, but you now insist upon appropriating this \$20,000,000 in the face of the fact that there are about \$18,000,000 of the appropriation made last year still unexpended, and are refusing to let go of these \$20,000,000, which you seem determined to raise by direct taxation. For fear you may have forgotten it, let me again call your attention to the last Democratic national convention, held in Baltimore, when you nominated Woodrow Wilson, and compare your course with your pledge to the people:

We denounce profligate waste of the money wrung from the people by oppressive taxation through the lavish appropriations of recent Republican Congresses, which have kept taxes high and reduced the purchasing power of the people's toll.

We demand a return to that simplicity and economy which befits a democratic government and a reduction in the number of useless offices, the salaries of which drain the substance of the people.

Does that sound consistent with your actions here and now, when you are in power? Do you not think that your extra taxation which you have laid upon the people will "drain the substance of the people," and this after you have plunged the country into an industrial depression through the enactment of the



Underwood tariff bill, which has destroyed to a large extent the opportunities of the wage earners of the country, who in the last analysis are compelled to pay these taxes?

Laying all politics aside, let us consider what is the situation confronting us. We passed a river and harbor bill during the winter when no one dreamed of a war in Europe and the governmental receipts may have justified the expenditure of the money; but since that time a war in Europe has broken out and this has caused the President to demand extra and new taxation in order to defray the expenses of the Government, and last week a bill in accordance with the ideas of our Democratic friends passed this House by their votes, and their votes only, not a single Republican or Progressive voting for it, and before the ink is hardly dry on the signature of the Clerk of the House, transmitting it to the Senate, you now propose, in face of your repeated promises of economy, in the face of the immense appropriation made last year, in face of the economic record of the Republicans in the past, in face of the fact that no Congress preceding the last Congress has ever appropriated or passed two river and harbor bills in any one Congress, you propose at this time, when we are laying new burdens of taxation upon the people, to appropriate another \$20,000,000, which is not needed, and you compel every man who signs a promissory note to contribute to these river and harbor improvements; every man who sends an express or freight package will contribute to these river and harbor improvements; every man who signs a deed will pay 50 cents on each \$100 of value, so that it may be sunk in river and harbor improvements; every man who takes out life insurance will pay 8 cents on each \$100 of insurance to contribute to these expenditures; every man who takes out fire insurance will pay 5 mills on each dollar of premium for the same purpose; every wage earner and every farmer who is compelled to borrow money and mortgage his property because of the industrial depression and hard times will contribute 25 cents on each \$500 of mortgage above \$1,000 for the same purpose. I can not go into the details of this bill, because the whole bill is so obnoxious to me, because it is unnecessary, that I will waste no time to discuss it; but I ask you frankly, you Democrats of the House, is it worth while? Do you want to go to the country upon the proposition that you will appropriate now \$20,000,000 for river and harbor improvements, while you are at the same time adding to the taxes of the people? These improvements that have been started can easily be maintained by an appropriation of \$5,000,000, and will not be injured if they wait over until such time that the money is available and need not be collected by special taxation. As stated before, \$16,000,000 in 1899 carried them along all right for two years, \$26,000,000 more in 1902 carried them along all right for four years, and the \$41,000,000 appropriated last year certainly should be sufficient to carry them until the next session of Congress. And let me suggest to you here and now that, if you will accept our advice and cut out these needless appropriations which you may as well cut out as not, it is just possible that the Senate may see fit to strike out all of those odious stamp taxes in the war-revenue bill. Let me appeal to you in behalf of the people of this country, and especially in behalf of the people of my district, that you put into practice your professions of economy and abandon your seemingly utter disregard and wasteful, extravagant expenditures of the people's money.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have been in this House for nearly 10 years, and during all that time I have observed the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], and I never thought that I should live to see this day, bringing, as it does, the spectacle of the father of the "Payne bill" weeping great tears of grief over the extravagance of Congress. It is a sight that I never thought these eyes of mine would behold. [Laughter.] And then the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD], another disciple of all the extravagance which has characterized the proceedings of Congress for many years, delivers to us a lecture on economy. Oh, ye gods! [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

But, Mr. Speaker, I rose to refer to some remarks that were made a few days ago by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR]. That gentleman saw fit to make an attack upon a couple of rivers in my State. One was the Kissimmee River; and in the course of his remarks he made this statement, which will be found on page 10620 of the Record:

A letter to the engineers is quoted in House Document No. 137, which shows up the \$47,000 Kissimmee Creek fraud. This creek, it will be remembered, is shown by the engineer's reports to be dry for periods varying from five to eight months in a single year.

Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand the report referred to, and the gentleman can not point to a single line in this or any other

engineer's report which states that the river was dry at all for any period of time. I want to call your attention to what the engineers do say. This is a letter from Gen. Bixby, under date of July 8, 1913, and in the course of that letter he makes this statement:

Although the amount of commerce handled is small, the special board is of the opinion that this river is worthy of improvement to the extent of maintaining at mean low-water stages a 3-foot channel over the entire 137 miles from Kissimmee to Lake Okeechobee, for which a light-draft dredge and tender will be required at an estimated cost of \$35,000 for construction, \$12,000 for dredging the first year, and \$8,000 for six months' operation annually thereafter.

Then, further down, we find this:

The board concurs with the special board in believing that it is advisable for the United States to maintain a 3-foot channel in the Kissimmee River from Kissimmee to Lake Okeechobee.

Mr. FREAR. Will the gentleman permit me to point out the report where the statement is found?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I can not yield; I will not. I have the report here. Here is a letter from Mr. Beach, of the Corps of Engineers. He speaks of the low-water surface of Lake Okeechobee, Kissimmee, and Caloosahatchee, and I want to say right here that some statement has been made that this survey of Lake Okeechobee, the Kissimmee and Caloosahatchee Rivers was a scheme to drain certain lands in that vicinity. That statement is absolutely untrue. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that the original provision for this survey was put in the river and harbor bill at the instance of the State authorities to determine whether or not after a survey the Federal Government would object to the State lowering the water in Okeechobee in order to carry out their drainage operations, but it was not to cost the United States Government one single, solitary cent. The State was doing the drainage work and this survey was for the sole purpose of determining whether or not the water in that lake could be lowered by the State for drainage purposes without interfering with the navigability of the lake and the rivers, and it was in no sense a scheme to have the Government drain lands in Florida at all. To continue, Mr. Speaker, from this report:

It appears from the information now available that the section of country covered by this report is rapidly developing, that it is reasonable to believe that there will be a steady increase in the amount of commerce produced in the future, and that as practically all the territory tributary to both the Kissimmee and Caloosahatchee Rivers is dependent upon these streams for transportation any improvement in their navigability will be of material benefit. After long-continued droughts the minimum depth is sometimes reduced to less than 1 foot at shoal places in the upper portion of the river.

There is not one single, solitary line anywhere in it about the river ever having been dry. There is a letter here from Capt. Clay Johnson, captain of a steamer that plies the Kissimmee River, and in that letter he says:

THE WATERS & CARSON GROCERY CO.,  
Kissimmee City, Fla., March 30, 1909.

Mr. J. M. BRAXTON,  
United States Engineer Office, Jacksonville, Fla.

DEAR SIR: The length of time that the boats have been tied up on account of low water on the Kissimmee River and canals since the year 1901 is as follows:

For the year—	Months.
1902.....	6½
1903.....	None.
1904.....	4
1905.....	1½
1906.....	None.
1907.....	8
1908.....	5

In regard to improving the river I would say, first, to lock the canals between Kissimmee City and Lake Kissimmee, which will throw all the water into one channel and give better water where it is so shoal now; cut off the sharp points so that the boats can make the turns easier, and I think a great deal of good to the run will be accomplished.

Yours, sincerely,

CLAY JOHNSON.

P. S.—Will have postmaster forward record of rainfall.

It will be observed that Capt. Johnson does not say one word about this river ever being dry. Mr. Speaker, this is a figment, pure and simple, of the gentleman's imagination. There is not one word in the Record anywhere to justify it.

With reference now to the Oklawaha River, the gentleman on page 5417 of the Record says, paraphrasing Mother Goose:

We have a crooked creek that has a crooked name, and grabs a crooked million while in a crooked game; to make a crooked water power run up a crooked hill it crooks your Uncle Samuel through a crooked river bill.

Now, this statement, in alleged rhyme, I have no doubt the gentleman believes is the very acme of refined humor, but the trouble is that there is not a scintilla of fact upon which to base it. It is entirely lacking in truth. The gentleman is undoubtedly seeking to pose for the benefit of the "folks back home" as a "watchdog of the Treasury," but, unfortunately for him, his record is against him. Why, Mr. Speaker, this gentleman has presented to this House during this session of

Congress two bills to take \$75,000 in each case from the Treasury to construct Government buildings in towns in his district, one of them with a little over 2,000 population, and the other with a little over 3,000 population. What is that when you are dealing in crooked games? Is there anything crooked about that? Maybe not. That is economy!

I want now to call attention to Document No. 415, with reference to the Oklawaha River. This document says:

The district officer states that the towns in the vicinity of the lakes have a commerce amounting to about 110,000 tons, none of which is now shipped by water. Ocala has a commerce amounting to about 300,000 tons, of which practically none is now handled by water. The district officer believes that a conservative estimate of the saving that would result from the improvement on a basis of 200,000 tons of commerce would be about \$600,000 annually. He believes that the river is worthy of improvement, under certain conditions named, to the extent of providing a 6-foot channel, at an estimated cost of \$616,000 and \$12,000 annually for maintenance. The division engineer concurs generally in the views of the district officer, and reports the locality as worthy of improvement by the United States.

Yet this is a crooked game, that saves to the people of that community over \$600,000 annually in freights upon their produce!

Mr. Speaker, this kind of economy talk makes me sick. There has never been a river and harbor bill more honestly framed, more carefully considered than this one, and I want to say to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] that when he was wearing swaddling clothes, politically—and he has hardly got them off yet—my colleague, the distinguished and honored chairman of this committee [Mr. SPARKMAN] was a member of this committee, and he knows more about the rivers and harbors and waterways of this country than the gentleman from Wisconsin would ever know if he lived to be as old as Methuselah. [Applause and laughter.] I want to say again, Mr. Speaker, that no Member of this House who has served here in all of the 20 years that the honored chairman of this committee has been here would have gotten up on this floor and reflected upon him as the gentleman from Wisconsin has seen fit to do, without rhyme or reason, and without facts to support it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POW). The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, for 20 years the able and honored chairman of this committee, Mr. SPARKMAN, has served his State and his country upon the floor of this House. For practically all of that time he has been a member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and for the past four years he has been its chairman. There are men here on both sides of this Chamber who for all these 20 years have observed his work as a Representative, and I hazard nothing when I proclaim that no man of loftier purpose, stricter integrity, and manlier conduct ever occupied a seat upon this floor. He is absolutely incapable of engaging in a "crooked game" here or elsewhere, no matter what the stake may be. His name will live in the history of waterway improvement in this country long after the names of the puny critics of this river and harbor bill shall have been effaced from the memory of men.

Mr. Speaker, for many years past the Congress, recognizing the navigability of the Kissimmee and Oklawaha Rivers, has been making appropriations for them.

In 1902, under a Republican administration, a project for the improvement of the Kissimmee River was adopted. The project provided for a channel 3 feet deep at ordinary low-water stages and from 30 to 60 feet wide for about 99.5 miles, from the town of Kissimmee to Fort Bassenger. Ever since that time Republican Congresses have been appropriating the people's money to carry on this project, and not one howl of economy has been raised against it until the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] broke into Congress and discovered that Republican Congresses, Democratic Congresses, Boards of Engineers, and Secretaries of War had all been engaged for all these years in a "crooked game."

In House Document No. 137, Sixty-third Congress, first session, at page 5, Col. Lansing H. Beach, Corps of Engineers, says:

In his report on preliminary examination, under the act of 1903, the district officer reports that 3 small steamboats, drawing about 2 feet, and 50 to 60 launches are in use on the river; that these boats can be operated at ordinary low stages of the water, but that navigation practically ceases during long-continued dry weather. He states that there appears to be about 10,000 tons of freight handled on the Kissimmee River and 30,000 tons in the town of Kissimmee. At a hearing before this board on April 28, 1913, statistics were presented by local parties claiming a present tonnage of about 85,000 tons on the Kissimmee River in addition to 15,000 passengers carried.

From the same document, at page 14, I desire to submit a statement of estimated freights carried on the Kissimmee River

for the three years ending December 31, 1905, and December 31, 1906, respectively:

## EXHIBIT A.

STATE BANK OF KISSIMMEE,  
Kissimmee, Fla., June 25, 1906.

W. H. CALDWELL,  
Assistant Engineer.

DEAR SIR: Replying to your favor requesting estimates of freights transported on Kissimmee River and connections, I beg to submit the following for the year ending December 31, 1905:

	Pounds.
Bricks	32,000
Lumber	500,000
Other building material	200,000
Crossties	120,000
Crate material	400,000
Fertilizers	400,000
Fish	1,500,000
Grain	750,000
Hay	120,000
Hides	50,000
Rosin and turpentine	300,000
Oranges and fruits	400,000
Vegetables	50,000
Groceries	1,000,000
General merchandise	200,000
Logs	12,500,000
Cattle and sheep	1,500,000
	20,022,000

Comparing this with the estimate of previous years will show the progress and impetus given to freights on the river.

Very respectfully,

CLAY JOHNSON.

## EXHIBIT B.

STATE BANK OF KISSIMMEE,  
Kissimmee, Fla., June 24, 1907.

W. H. CALDWELL,  
Assistant Engineer.

DEAR SIR: Replying to your favor requesting estimate of freights transported on Kissimmee River and connections, I beg to submit the following for the year ending December 31, 1906:

	Pounds.
Bricks	32,000
Lumber	500,000
Other building material	200,000
Crossties	120,000
Crate material	400,000
Fertilizers	400,000
Fish	1,500,000
Grain	750,000
Hay	120,000
Hides	50,000
Rosin and turpentine	500,000
Oranges and fruits	400,000
Vegetables	50,000
Groceries	1,000,000
General merchandise	200,000
Cattle and sheep	1,500,000
Logs	12,500,000

## EXHIBIT C.

	Pounds.
Lumber, 20,000 feet daily	24,000,000
Grain and groceries	10,000,000
Turpentine and rosin	2,000,000
Crossties	10,000,000
Oranges and vegetables	6,000,000
Cattle and sheep	3,000,000
Fertilizers	500,000
General merchandise	5,000,000
Wood	500,000
	61,000,000

Now, Mr. Speaker, I desire to call attention a little further to the proposed improvement of the Oklawaha River and as to the necessities for that improvement. In House Document No. 514, Sixty-third Congress, second session, at page 5, in the report of Maj. Lansing H. Beach, the following language is used:

There seems to be a very general demand for this improvement and a firm belief that it would result in a very marked development throughout the adjacent country and create a commerce of considerable magnitude. There is a large section of very rich and fertile country tributary to this waterway and to the lakes at its head, which is being converted into orange groves and truck farms. It is stated that under present conditions business is hampered by high transportation charges and by congestion in rail freights during the busy season, and that relief can be obtained only by a competitive waterway.

Again, in the same document, on page 8, I read from the report of Capt. J. R. Slattery, Corps of Engineers, a portion of a former report made by Capt. Sackett, and which is quoted by Capt. Slattery, as follows:

I am informed that during the time the Oklawaha steamers ran to Leesburg the rate on a box of oranges from Leesburg to Jacksonville was 10 cents. Shipments from the large orange groves at Emerald, situated on the river and on Lake Griffin where the river leaves the lake, are now required to be made across the lake on a boat owned by the railroad and delivered at the terminal owned by the railroad at Leesburg. The rate from Emerald to Leesburg is 9 cents per box and the rate from Leesburg to Jacksonville is 17 cents, a total of 26 cents, as against the rate of 10 cents formerly enjoyed. There is said to be 100,000 boxes of oranges and vegetables shipped from Emerald annually. This represents a very considerable burden upon the shippers of this locality. It is said to frequently happen that during the rush of the shipping season the railroads can not or do not supply sufficient



cars to care for the shipments offered, and much delay and often considerable loss is occasioned thereby.

Again, on page 19, Capt. Slattery, after giving a statement of the commercial statistics of the towns and localities tributary to the Oklawaha, sums the whole matter up by using this language:

From the foregoing statement it will be seen that there are approximately 500,000 to 600,000 tons of freight, the transportation charges on which will be affected more or less by the improvement on the Oklawaha River.

On the same page of the report, Capt. Slattery again says:

If as a result of the improvement of the river there should be a general reduction of 15 cents per hundredweight in rail rates, approximately the existing difference between the Sanford and the Leesburg and Ocala rates on sixth-class goods, the total saving in freight would amount to \$1,800,000. I do not believe that any such saving as this is probable, but I believe it would be conservative to estimate that a saving of 15 cents per hundredweight would result on 200,000 tons, making a total annual saving of \$600,000, if a 6-foot channel were provided.

I want to say just here that Capt. Slattery is one of the ablest officers and ablest engineers attached to our military establishment, and after he had made a full and complete investigation and personal inspection of the Oklawaha River and the country tributary thereto, and had thoroughly examined into the present and reasonably prospective commerce, he sums the whole matter up, on page 20 of the report, by using the following language:

In view of the material saving that would probably be effected in freight charges if the river were improved, the promising character of much of the territory that borders the lakes and the swamp through which the river flows, and the fact that an improved waterway along this line would be a step toward a trans-Florida canal along the best route as recommended by a special board of engineer officers, I am of the opinion that the Oklawaha River is worthy of improvement to the extent of providing a 6-foot channel from its mouth to Mount Dora.

Notwithstanding the fact, however, that this matter has been so thoroughly investigated and the project approved by the district officer, the division officer, and the Board of Engineers and the Chief of Engineers, and was then approved by the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors, it remained for the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] to belittle it and to put his judgment in the scale as against the judgment of all these gentlemen. We have the testimony of every engineer, and in fact of every individual who has examined the project who knows anything at all about the subject, that it is worthy of improvement by the Government of the United States and ought to be undertaken. With these facts and with this record, I am willing to submit the case to the judgment of my colleagues upon this floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN].

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Speaker, responding immediately to the last statement of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK], in reference to the garb of the gentleman from Wisconsin, who he said was wearing only "his political swaddling clothes," I presume the friends of the gentleman from Wisconsin will congratulate him upon wearing those early garments rather than wearing what a great many gentlemen who are trying to get through this big river and harbor bill will be wearing pretty soon, namely, their political shrouds. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. Speaker, in considering the situation that is here I do not see any reason for intense partisanship. I am in favor of reasonable improvements, whether they are in the interior of this great country of ours or along the coasts or along the banks of the great rivers. But this seems to be the proposition before the American people now: How much of this money shall be used, and what are we trying to use it for? It was enormous as it passed the House. It was \$53,000,000 to begin with in the Senate. It was reduced by a determined minority to \$20,000,000. The purpose of the bill seems to be to purchase water to fill some rivers and some harbors and to let it run through some creeks which perhaps were never moist except in the case of a heavy dew. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

But the next proposition in the disposition of the people's money, after we buy water to fill the rivers and harbors, is to buy ships to float on this purchased water in these moistened harbors and rivers. [Applause on the Republican side.]

And how do we expect to get the money to buy this water in which to float these ships on these rivers and harbors? We have just solved that in the last few days. We passed a war-revenue tax bill in time of peace to grind the faces of the poor and press down upon and overload the industries of this country. These being the main propositions before the American people, it seems we ought to make the burden just as light as possible. Therefore I am in favor of reducing the sum to be here appropriated to the smallest amount possible, for two reasons: First, the \$20,000,000 proposition is to be taken from

under the jurisdiction and the authority of Members of this House and its coordinate body, and is to be given to the administration of an executive branch of this Government to be disposed of by it and beyond the control of the membership of this body. We ought to have the right and power to determine when or in what part of the United States this money should be spent. But if we are to abdicate our authority and jurisdiction over the funds of the people of the United States, we ought to abdicate for as small an amount as possible.

The second reason why this amount should be small is this: We should set the pace for economy for the other body, or, perhaps, we should respond to the example that has been so well set by the other body in this bill. The war-revenue measure provides for the taxing of the American people to raise about a quarter of a billion of dollars during its probable lifetime. Taking into account when the bill will probably become a law and the period within which it all will be in force, there will be a quarter of a billion collected from the people. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] said the Senate slept with this bill for six months and reduced it to \$20,000,000. Let us send it back for another nap, and let it be cut to \$5,000,000. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Nebraska asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY].

[Mr. LANGLEY addressed the House. See Appendix.]

Mr. SPARKMAN. How many more speeches will the gentleman have?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I will only have two—one very short.

Mr. SPARKMAN. All right, then, proceed until you have used up one more speech, and then I will proceed.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Speaker, this morning I attempted to give my reasons why I was opposed to the Senate amendment. I have no criticism of the bill as reported to the House. I think it was made up honestly. I do not think there was any politics or partisanship in it. Of course, there may have been some mistakes. In addition to what I said this morning, in view of the changed conditions which have come about, and in view of the fact it will only be a few months before we make up another bill, and in view of the fact that on a great many projects no money can be expended until after the 4th of next March, I think we ought to listen to the demand that has come from the people that we economize. The condition throughout the country is most deplorable. Even the majority now admit this. We may not agree what has caused this condition, but we know that it exists. You gentlemen upon that side of the aisle say it is due to the war. Upon this side of the aisle we say that the condition existed before the war. I call the attention of the House and the country to this fact as having some bearing upon the condition in the country to-day, that every day that the present Democratic tariff law has been upon the statute books we have lost more than \$1,000,000 in our foreign trade, and every day of this session of Congress a Democratic majority, pledged to economy, has already spent \$363,000 more than the most extravagant Republican Congress that ever met in this Capitol.

I think you can find explanation for the condition of the country here in these enormous expenditures, surpassing any that have ever been made, and by the tremendous falling off in our trade. The falling off in our foreign trade alone amounts to \$1,000,000 each day in wages taken from the Americans and given to the foreigner.

Mr. COOPER. And had been before the war?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The condition I am speaking of was before the war. In other words, our foreign trade decreased \$248,000,000 this year up to August 1. This is the calendar year. And the people everywhere are economizing. The people of this country to-day are not spending as much for clothes as they did a year ago. They are not eating as much as they did a year ago. They are denying themselves amusements and pleasures. Every man that is in business is being compelled to economize. We have heard economy talked on that side of the aisle, and I trust that every man on this side will vote for real economy. There is no great necessity why we should have a sum greater than \$5,000,000 to take care of our river and harbor projects until we can pass another bill. [Applause.] It has been suggested that if the appropriation



is cut to \$5,000,000 that many of the projects in the State of Washington will suffer. Even if that is true I would be unworthy of a place upon this floor if I thought only of my own State. I know that I represent a constituency that do not want what they are not willing to grant to their neighbor. At this time, when they are being forced to economize in everything, the people of my State do not want to be further taxed to care for the river and harbor projects of others that can without great injury be passed for a time, and they do not want the rest of the country taxed to pay for theirs in the same condition. Except in a few localities, owing to climatic conditions and to the fact that the force on many projects have already scattered because of the long delay in passing this bill, but little work can be done until next spring. The war in Europe may have ended by then. In a few weeks another bill can be made up in view of the conditions as they then exist. In my own State, whether we pass a bill for \$20,000,000 or \$5,000,000 will make little difference. We will get little, if any, of the \$20,000,000, except for maintenance, and we will get that if only \$5,000,000 is appropriated. Under either proposition the much-needed improvement at Willapa Harbor will not be cared for. Under either no surveys will be authorized. This omission will result in great injury to the Lake Washington Canal. Here we have strikingly illustrated the iniquity of the Senate amendment where a great project costing more than \$5,000,000 is indefinitely delayed by a refusal to grant a survey that probably would not cost the Government \$50. In fact it is merely a formality, but this can not be done. Looking at it from a purely selfish standpoint, it makes practically no difference to western Washington whether the bill carries \$5,000,000 or \$20,000,000 if it is given in a lump sum. We will get practically the same amount in either event. But for the good of the river and harbor improvements in this country in the future I think it would be infinitely better for us to appropriate only a sufficient sum to maintain present projects until the next session of Congress.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY].

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Speaker, how much time did I use?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Three minutes.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend. by striking out, in lines 24 and 25, on page 66, the words "the mouth of the Ohio River" and insert in lieu thereof "Rock Island, Ill."

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, this amendment is made for the purpose of correcting what I believe to have been an error made by the Senate. It does not increase the amount of the appropriation as agreed upon in the Senate. The effect of the amendment is to provide that any moneys expended on the Mississippi River, under the direction of the Mississippi River Commission, for the purpose of revetting banks and assistance in levee building, shall be expended not on the lower Mississippi River alone, but also on the upper river as far north as Rock Island, Ill.

This is not a new project. In the bill of 1913 an appropriation of \$200,000 was made for the upper river for the purpose of making surveys, the balance left after paying the expense of the surveys to be allotted among the several levee districts on the upper river; and this was done. The surveys were made, and they cost \$10,000, leaving \$190,000 of this amount which the Mississippi River Commission have actually allotted to levee districts on the upper Mississippi River. The original act establishing the Mississippi River Commission in 1878 gave it jurisdiction all the way from the Head of the Passes to the headwaters of the river. Appropriations heretofore have been made, however, for the purpose of levee building, to be expended under the control of the Mississippi River Commission, and have until 1913 been limited to points below the mouth of the Ohio River.

Now, I expect to vote for this bill whether this amendment is adopted or not. I always vote for river and harbor bills, and I regret exceedingly the emasculation of this bill in the Senate. The effect of the Senate amendment is to declare martial law for the rivers of the United States, and leave it to the discretion of Army engineers as to how \$20,000,000 is to be expended. The place to economize is not in the rivers of the country, the great freight regulators reaching out through all the States; the place to economize is somewhere else.

Now, I hope this amendment will prevail. It will not make any difference whatever in the amount of this appropriation if it does prevail. It simply is an act of justice for the levee

districts on the upper river, and there are nearly 50 of them maintained now by the owners of the land back of them, not assisted by the Government in any way, although the Government heretofore has on two or three occasions assisted in levee building on the upper river. Back of these levees—and there are 216 miles of levees along this stretch from Cape Girardeau north to Rock Island, Ill.—in the State of Illinois alone, there are nearly 800,000 acres of the best land in the world, that can all be reclaimed. On these rich alluvial bottoms along the upper river it is possible to raise every year, if the river is kept out of the levee districts, 60,000,000 bushels of corn, worth at the present prices of corn in this country over \$40,000,000. Money expended on levees on the upper river is not wasted, because the river does not wander around through a wide valley, but maintains its channel, and we have the kind of material up there for the building of levees which hold against overflows, and when a levee is once built, if it is built high enough and wide enough at the base, it will hold back almost any flood in the upper Mississippi River.

The land back of these levees on the upper river will produce other crops than corn. It will produce wheat, rye, oats, potatoes, clover, alfalfa; in fact, anything that will grow in the North Temperate Zone can be produced on this land—the richest land in all the world, more fertile than the land in the valley of the Nile. The principal crop, of course, is corn. They grow corn in all the nations of the world. Every European nation produces corn; but these lands on the upper river we are trying to reclaim will produce every year one-third as much corn as can be produced in all of Europe. The land back of these levees will produce more corn every year than we can ever expect the Argentine Republic to send us in one year, even if we have in this country another shortage equal to that of last year.

We consider corn to be just as valuable a crop as cotton, adding just as much to the national wealth. If the cotton plantations of the South are to be protected against the ravages of this great river, the same reasons for protection apply also to the cornfields of the North.

There is no conceivable reason why Government aid for levees should stop at Cape Girardeau, Mo. In 1878, when the present policy was adopted, it was contemplated in the act that the jurisdiction of the Mississippi River Commission should extend as far north as the headwaters of the Mississippi River. My amendment to this bill simply restores to this commission a part of the jurisdiction of which it has been deprived and permits the commission to assist in levee building as far north as Rock Island, Ill., out of the fund provided for levee building on the Mississippi River.

The bill of 1913 appropriated \$200,000 for levees on the upper river; \$190,000 of this amount remains. This is not a new project—Government aid for levees on the upper river. The surveys have been made; the commission has reached its conclusions as to what districts ought to be helped. They have in their hands now \$190,000 to assist in the work on the upper levees.

The Senate substitute, which we are now considering, through an error, I believe, deprives the commission of the jurisdiction of the upper river that it was given in the act of 1913. In the Senate there was no objection to expending a portion of the fund allowed for levee building on the upper river. This was not a subject of criticism in the Senate. The most violent stretch of imagination can not say that this part of the bill is improper or can be considered a "pork-barrel" measure, and no one in the Senate made a charge of that character. This is simply an oversight which ought to be corrected, in justice to thousands of farmers in the North engaged in producing cereals for the Nation.

Even if my amendment is adopted, every dollar provided for in the Senate substitute which may be allotted to levee building can still be expended on the lower river if the commission thinks the flood situation demands that it be expended there; and even if any part of it is spent on the upper river, we expect by far the greater portion of the amount allotted for levees to be expended on the lower river.

I have every reason to believe that this merely formal amendment which I propose will be accepted without difficulty by the Senate and will not imperil the passage of this bill. If I thought it would, I would not insist upon it at this time.

I sincerely hope the amendment will be adopted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BALTZ. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. RAINEY. My time has expired.



Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK]. [Loud applause.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, I am very much in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY]. But before I discuss that I want to state emphatically that there is no ground whatever for claiming that this was a sectional bill originally. That is settled by reading the list of the gentlemen who compose this Committee on Rivers and Harbors. There are 9 southern men on that committee, counting Missouri and West Virginia as Southern States, and 12 northern men. The list of the committee is: Mr. SPARKMAN of Florida, Mr. BURGESS of Texas, Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi, Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama, Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia, Mr. SMALL of North Carolina, Mr. BOOHER of Missouri, Mr. GALLAGHER of Illinois, Mr. DRISCOLL of New York, Mr. DONOHUE of Pennsylvania, Mr. SCULLY of New Jersey, Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts, Mr. LIEB of Indiana, Mr. KETNER of California, Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington, Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa, Mr. BARCHFELD of Pennsylvania, Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia, Mr. SWITZER of Ohio, Mr. POWERS of Kentucky, and Mr. TREADWAY of Massachusetts; and Massachusetts and Pennsylvania are the only two States in the Union that have two members each on that committee.

I would be perfectly willing to adopt the speeches of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] as my speech. This amendment, offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY], does not increase the amount to be spent one cent. It simply undertakes to do for the Mississippi River north of the mouth of the Ohio River partially what it does for the river south of the mouth of the Ohio River.

The northern portion of the Mississippi River runs through the richest country under heaven—richer than the valley of the Ganges or the Delta of the Nile. It is in the heart of the continent. It has on its banks great cities and manufacturing plants, to say nothing of the vast agricultural products. St. Louis is the metropolis of the Mississippi Valley and it is on the upper Mississippi River.

At Louisiana, in the county that I live in, is the largest nursery on the face of the earth. About 4 miles above that, in the same county, on the banks of the Mississippi, is the largest dynamite mill in the world. About 20 miles above that—still in my district, but not in my county, in Ralls County—is what is called the Hannibal cement plant, although Hannibal itself is in Mr. LLOYD's district. That is the largest cement plant in the wide, wide world. In addition to that you have the cities of Louisiana, Hannibal, Quincy (Ill.), Keokuk, Burlington, Muscatine, and finally at the north end of this part of the Mississippi that we propose to improve are the tri-cities, Davenport, Iowa, Rock Island and Moline, Ill., and there is a United States armory that ought to be made the largest in the United States.

It is just as important to improve the upper portion of the Mississippi River—perhaps not as important, because there is more water, and therefore there will be more commerce from the mouth of the Ohio down—but nevertheless and notwithstanding, it is a wise and economic principle in the long run to improve the upper Mississippi River and to improve the Missouri River, as the gentleman from Kansas City [Mr. BORLAND] stated.

I am not in favor of squandering or wasting money; but if it was wise—and I believe it was, and I helped along with it—to irrigate the dry lands of the West in order to settle up that country, why is it not just as wise to keep the waters of the United States off of the lands along the Mississippi and the Missouri, to create homes for our children and our children's children? [Applause.] Of course, any drainage project should be so safeguarded that ultimately it will pay back to the Government every dollar advanced, just as it is expected and intended that the irrigation projects shall do.

There is enough overflowed land on the Mississippi and its tributaries—the richest land, acre for acre, under the shining sun—to make a State as big as the State of Missouri, that ultimately would support 25,000,000 people, right in the heart of civilization, where we have churches and railroads and schools and telephones and telegraphs and all the appliances of the highest civilization the world has ever known; but the very minute that anybody wants to do anything for the overflowed lands out in that country the yell goes up that it is a "pork" proposition. It is a monstrous canard, and that is all there is to it. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY].

Mr. MANN. Not yet.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN] is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Speaker, I have been listening all day to this debate, and have been trying to square my vote with the amendments that have been offered. My colleague, the ranking Member on the Republican side of this committee [Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington] has rendered faithful service in the matter of getting appropriations for harbors and for public buildings in the district that he has represented, and I feel a hesitancy when it comes to voting against an amendment that he proposes, on the ground that it does not get money for my State; but each and every one of the propositions submitted for the State of Washington and included in the report of the committee is a very meritorious proposition. Each project is a worthy one. I represent in part the entire State, as a Member at large on this floor, so that I feel an interest in each one of these projects, including the projects down at Willapa Harbor and at Grays Harbor, where my colleague [Mr. JOHNSON of Washington] is the Representative. But if we vote for \$5,000,000 instead of \$20,000,000, we shall, it seems to me, vote against the best interests of those projects. If they are meritorious propositions, as I know they are, they will very likely get in on the \$20,000,000; but if they do not get in on the \$20,000,000, they will surely have a better chance later on, if the \$20,000,000 is appropriated, than if the \$5,000,000 is appropriated. I can not, for the life of me, believe that I should be voting for the interests of my State if I voted for the \$5,000,000 amendment, as my colleagues, Mr. HUMPHREY and Mr. JOHNSON, have advised in their speeches on this floor. I can not believe that I should be voting for the interest of Willapa Harbor and Grays Harbor, that are represented by my colleague [Mr. JOHNSON of Washington]. I feel that when I vote for those improvements I am not only voting for the interest of my State, but I am voting for the interest of the country at large, and that a vote for them is a meritorious vote. That is why I am unable to accord any kind of approval to the proposition to eliminate \$15,000,000 from this bill. We need all that we can get. I do not believe we ought to economize in that way. I believe that \$20,000,000 is not too much to be appropriated. The original report of the committee, appropriating about \$40,000,000, was concurred in by the gentlemen of the minority generally. This bill directly benefits my people in the State of Washington as to those particular improvements, and I say it seems to me that I would not only be violating the interest of Willapa Harbor and Grays Harbor and the harbors in the district of my colleague [Mr. JOHNSON] and those in the district of my other colleague, but that I would also be violating the interests of the country at large if I were to vote for \$5,000,000 instead of \$20,000,000. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I do not care to discuss the political phases of this bill as it now presents itself to the House. I think it is futile to discuss whether the reduction in this river and harbor bill has been brought about by reason of the war in Europe or by reason of the filibuster of the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON]. The practical proposition that we must confront now and pass upon to-day is whether we shall adopt this \$20,000,000 proposition or defeat it and run the risk of getting more or none at all. I am frank to confess my regret that it has been necessary to bring into the House a bill appropriating the lump sum of \$20,000,000 to be expended by any department of the Government. There are many meritorious propositions and projects in the United States which ought not to be delayed or deferred. I indorse absolutely and in toto every word that the Speaker of the House uttered a moment ago with reference to the Mississippi River. The Mississippi and the Ohio are the two great rivers in the United States that may be considered national propositions. Several years ago, under the leadership of the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], a project was inaugurated to canalize the Ohio River from the head of navigation to its mouth on the Mississippi.

If the investment of Government money in the Ohio River will not prove a successful and paying investment from the standpoint of commerce, then it is absolutely useless to spend money on any other river in the United States, for on either side of that great stream, both north and south, there are not only rich acres of fertile land but numerous cities dotting either bank from the mouth to the head of navigation. Not only that, but there are tributaries to this great river like the



Cumberland, which above Nashville carried more than 9,000,000 tons of freight last year and below Nashville practically the same amount, which runs into the coal regions which has as much coal as there is in Alaska, where we propose to spend \$40,000,000 to take out coal and ice and other materials indigenous to that country. If the canalization of the rivers of the central Ohio, Mississippi, Missouri, Tennessee, and the Cumberland will not be a paying investment, I think the sooner we disband and abolish all river improvements the better it will be for the country at large.

I regret—whether it be chargeable to a filibuster in another body of Congress or on account of the European war—that we are compelled as a matter of necessity to take \$20,000,000 in a lump sum or run the risk of getting no improvements whatever. I have confidence in the Board of Engineers and believe that they will allot the money where it will be most necessary. I hope that they will allot it to such places and will not undertake to satisfy every Member of Congress. I am willing to give up a portion of that which will come to my district if it will help the others. I am willing, if it is necessary, to sacrifice a part of the appropriation for the rivers that affect my district, which has more miles of navigable streams than any other district in the United States, composed, as it is, of the Mississippi, Ohio, Tennessee, and Cumberland, but I do believe that the Board of Engineers, with patriotism and expert knowledge, will allot the money to the Mississippi River Commission, which will have charge of that allotted to the Mississippi, and will parcel out the money where it will be most economically spent not only for navigation and commerce but for the saving of the lives of the people and the destruction of property.

I have not time to recount the great destruction of property from the mouth of the Ohio River to New Orleans, a region where the Government of the United States is undertaking to prevent destruction and loss of life.

As I say, in the absence of any better proposition, in the absence of the hope of getting more, under protest, I am willing to vote for the \$20,000,000 proposition which the Senate has sent over to us.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POW). The gentleman has 14 minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield, Mr. Speaker, to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DONOHUE].

[Mr. DONOHUE addressed the House. See Appendix.]

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LIEB].

[Mr. LIEB addressed the House. See Appendix.]

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER].

[Mr. FOSTER addressed the House. See Appendix.]

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY].

[Mr. STANLEY addressed the House. See Appendix.]

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HOLLAND].

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for this amendment, not because I favor it but because I am unwilling that the projects therein provided for and already commenced shall be temporarily abandoned and thousands of men now engaged in work on these improvements thrown out of employment. I am opposed, however, to the appropriation of a "lump sum" to be expended under the direction of the Board of Engineers, as provided for in this amendment. The money appropriated for these improvements ought to be allotted in accordance with the merits of all the various projects recommended by the engineers, and should not be confined simply to old projects, some of which may be of far less importance than the new ones. I am also opposed to it because I know that whatever allotments may be made by the Board of Engineers will probably subject the members thereof to the criticism, whether just or unjust, of yielding to the importunities of the more influential Members of this body. This might tend to lessen our confidence in this board.

But, Mr. Speaker, I arose to say only a few words in support of the project for the improvement of the Norfolk-Portsmouth and Newport News Channels. This is a new project and will be defeated by the adoption of this amendment. I very much regret this, because I know that the commerce of these ports is amply sufficient to justify the appropriations recommended by the Board of Engineers. The amount recommended for this

project by the Board of Engineers was only \$1,114,000, and the bill as it passed the House carried an initial appropriation of \$400,000 therefor.

I have heard much said to-day about the commerce of the great ports of Boston, New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore. I am convinced that the commerce of these great ports is amply sufficient to justify us in making appropriations for their improvement. I believe that they should be improved in the interest of commerce. I have been somewhat surprised, however, that none of the speakers have included the port of Norfolk-Portsmouth among the great ports of the Atlantic seaboard. And yet, Mr. Speaker, the tonnage of the port of Norfolk-Portsmouth certainly ranks fourth, if not third, among the ports of the Atlantic coast, and the combined water tonnage of Norfolk-Portsmouth and Newport News is probably greater than that of any other port on the Atlantic coast, with the single exception of New York. The water commerce of the port of Norfolk-Portsmouth, which amounted to less than 2,000,000 tons in 1888, 5,000,000 tons in 1900, and 12,000,000 tons in 1910, for the fiscal year 1912 exceeded a total of 22,000,000 tons and a value of more than one and one-half billion dollars. The increased tonnage for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, was over 3,000,000 short tons. The same increase for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, would make the present tonnage of this port exceed 25,000,000 tons. It is doubtful if any port on the entire Atlantic coast can show a more steadily increasing tonnage, and if this increase continues, and it is confidently believed it will, the day is not far distant when its water tonnage will exceed that of some of its present rivals. It is already greater than any of the South Atlantic or Gulf ports, and when combined with the tonnage of Newport News, also provided for in the defeated project, it is doubtful if any port on the Atlantic coast, with the single exception of New York, can show a greater tonnage.

In addition to its commerce the Norfolk-Portsmouth Channel is traversed by naval vessels, including the largest colliers and battleships, going to and from the Norfolk Navy Yard. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, 6,666 vessels, of which 2,298 were American, 3,125 foreign steamers, and 33 foreign sailing vessels, cleared the port of Norfolk-Portsmouth. This does not include the large number of coastwise steamers and vessels having Norfolk as the southern terminus of their lines, and does not include the many local tugs and sailing vessels entering this port. The Norfolk-Portsmouth Channel is a very busy one. As many as four and five vessels are frequently seen abreast in the channel. The width of the channel is not sufficient for the actual demands of its business, and a greater width is demanded for its growing commerce.

The total appropriations made for the improvement of the Norfolk-Portsmouth Harbor from 1876 to 1914 aggregate only \$2,265,458.84, a small amount in comparison with the amounts expended for the improvement of the other great ports on the Atlantic seaboard. The steady growth of its commerce amply justifies the expenditure of this amount in the improvement of this harbor. I had hoped that the additional appropriation carried in the House bill for its further improvement would not be defeated. It is an improvement that ought not longer be neglected, and which the business of this harbor properly requires.

The bad projects, if any, in the House bill ought to have been eliminated, but projects of this character ought to have been provided for.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I never expect to agree with everybody else and seldom with anybody else. Hence I have no criticism to make of people who do not agree with me. I think it is a mistake in the House where some gentleman makes a fight, believing that he is right, that other Members of the House should therefore indulge in personal criticism, if not abuse. [Applause on the Republican side.] Hence I think some of the remarks which have been made to-day violently criticizing the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] were unjustifiable, although in many respects about the river and harbor bill I do not agree with him.

I was much surprised that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], for whom I have always entertained a high regard, descended so far in debate, as it seems to me he did, endeavoring to give a roast to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR], who I think is entitled to the thanks of the country for what he has done, whether he be right or wrong. [Applause on the Republican side.]

But the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], addressing the House with considerable fervor, said:

You call this a "pork-barrel" bill. It is no more a "pork-barrel" bill than the pension bills. I have always voted for pension bills, coming from the South as I do.



Mr. HARRISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. What for?

Mr. HARRISON. I know the gentleman does not want to misrepresent me, but I did not say that I always voted for pension bills; I said I believed in a reasonable pension for those who deserved it.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman said in effect that he always voted for the pension bills. If he does not make any change in his remarks, the RECORD will justify what I say. It excited my attention and recalled to my memory the fact that the gentleman was slightly in error, in my judgment, and I sent for the RECORD. We have had several roll calls on pension bills, both on private pension bills and on the general appropriation bills, during the last Congress. The gentleman said in effect, "Look at me; I favor pension bills to be paid to the northern soldiers, but you are now opposing a river and harbor bill to be expended in the South," and he criticized the gentlemen who were opposing the Senate amendment in this respect. And I find that on March 21, 1912, when the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUSSELL] moved to suspend the rules and pass a private omnibus pension bill, which was passed by a vote of 193 yeas to 34 nays, the name of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], while it did not lead all the rest, is to be found conspicuously among those voting nay; and on February 18, 1913, when the vote was taken again on the passage of an omnibus private pension bill, and the yeas and nays were ordered at the demand of Mr. Roddenbery, when the yeas were 219 and the nays were 40, that again the name of the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], who favors pension legislation and pension bills, is found recorded among those voting nay. And on March 9, 1912, when we had before us the annual appropriation bill making appropriations to pay those pensions which had already been allowed under the law, on a point of no quorum being made, and the yeas and nays being ordered, the yeas on the passage of the bill being 214 and the nays 38, I find that again the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, so ardently in favor of pension bills and pension appropriation bills, had his name recorded as voting nay.

Mr. Speaker, I should not have referred to this except for the holier-than-thou attitude which the gentleman from Mississippi assumed while criticizing the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR]. It is a pretty good thing when you live in a glass house not to throw stones. So much for that.

Mr. Speaker, the Spanish War was going on in 1898. I entered the House during that Congress. The first regular session was being held when the Spanish War was declared. That war was going on when Congress adjourned. Did the Republicans pass a river and harbor appropriation bill at that session of Congress? We passed a war-revenue bill, increasing the tax laid upon the people. Did we turn around then and appropriate money for river and harbor improvements which might easily wait over? We did not. We passed no river and harbor bill in 1898, during the continuance of the war, and immediately following the law providing for an increase in taxation. The next year, in 1899, what did we do? We passed a river and harbor bill which carried only \$16,000,000. Sixteen million dollars, and no river and harbor bill the year before. We passed a modest river and harbor bill, and shortly after that the Democratic national convention adopted a platform, bearing in mind even the appropriation of \$16,000,000 in two years for rivers and harbors, in which they made use of this language, and I read now from the Democratic platform of 1900:

We denounce the lavish appropriations of recent Republican Congresses, which have kept taxes high and which threaten the perpetuation of the oppressive war levies.

We favor the reduction and speedy repeal of the war taxes, and a return to the time-honored Democratic policy of strict economy in governmental expenditures.

[Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. Speaker, we passed no river and harbor bill during the Fifty-sixth Congress. The next river and harbor bill after 1899 was passed in 1902, at the first session of the Fifty-seventh Congress. We did not pass a river and harbor bill at the first session of the Fifty-eighth Congress. Three years passed by without the passage of a river and harbor bill, and, so far as I know, the country was not suffering anywhere because we were waiting on river and harbor improvements.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will yield me the time. I will yield if he will take it out of his time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois declines.

Mr. MANN. I decline to yield out of my time, but not out of his.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Then I will say what I have to say in my own time.

Mr. MANN. That is better. We appropriated \$16,000,000 in 1899, nothing in 1898, nothing in 1900, nothing in 1901, and in 1902 we appropriated \$26,000,000, and we had made no further appropriation up to the time that the Democratic convention met in 1904. That convention, foreseeing the future, foreseeing that in the Sixty-third Congress the Democratic Party would appropriate \$41,000,000 last year and try to appropriate \$53,000,000 this year—and even if it appropriates \$20,000,000 this year it will appropriate \$63,000,000 in two years, where the Republicans have appropriated \$26,000,000 in four years—in one of its planks adopted this language:

Large reductions can easily be made in the annual expenditures of the Government without impairing the efficiency of any branch of the public service, and we shall insist upon the strictest economy and frugality compatible with vigorous and efficient civil, military, and naval administration as a right of the people too clear to be denied or withheld.

Think of it! A Democratic national convention said that \$16,000,000 in two years was gross extravagance; that \$26,000,000 in four years was a wanton expenditure, and the country has not changed very much since then, as far as any river and harbor improvements are concerned. And now last year this Congress having appropriated \$41,000,000, as much as a Republican Congress had appropriated in six years, you insist upon appropriating another \$20,000,000 in the face of the platform of the last Democratic national convention. I know you want to forget it, but I am going to read it to you. I do not blame you for wishing you could tear it out of the platform:

We denounce the profligate waste of the money wrung from the people by oppressive taxation through the lavish appropriations of recent Republican Congresses, which have kept taxes high and reduced the purchasing power of the people's toil. We demand a return to that simplicity and economy which befits a democratic government and a reduction in the number of useless offices, the salaries of which drain the substance of the people.

[Applause on the Republican side.]

I am glad to note that a few gentlemen on the Democratic side can still applaud that utterance in that platform without blushing. [Laughter on the Republican side.] Most of them can not do it. [Applause on the Republican side.] What is the situation confronting us? We passed a river and harbor bill during the winter, when no one dreamed of a war in Europe. The governmental receipts may have justified the expenditure of the money, but since that time a war in Europe has broken out which has caused this administration to demand a new taxation. The ink is hardly dry on the signature of the Clerk of this House transmitting to the Senate a bill to increase the taxes of the people and now, in the face of the record of the past, in the face of the fact that no Congress preceding the last Congress has ever appropriated or passed two rivers and harbors bills in any one Congress, you propose to reverse all the policy of the Government in the past, at this time when we are laying new burdens of taxation upon the people, and appropriate the money, which is not needed for present maintenance of projects. Every man who signs a promissory note will contribute to these river and harbor improvements which might wait over without damage; every man who sends an express or freight package will contribute to these river and harbor expenditures; every man who sends a telephone or telegraph message will contribute to these river and harbor expenditures; every man who signs a deed will pay 50 cents on each \$500 of value that it may be sunk in river and harbor improvements; every man who takes out life insurance will pay 8 cents on each \$100 of insurance to contribute to these rivers and harbors expenditures; every man who takes out fire insurance will pay 5 mills on each \$1 of premium to the same end; every man who is hard up and mortgages his property will contribute 25 cents on each \$500 of mortgage above \$1,000 to this end. Is it worth the while? Do you think on the Democratic side of the House that you want to go to the country upon the proposition that you propose to appropriate now \$20,000,000 for river and harbor improvements while you are in the meanwhile adding to the taxes of the people? These improvements will not be injured if they wait over. Sixteen million dollars in 1899 carried them along well; \$26,000,000 more in 1902 carried them along well; \$41,000,000 last year was sufficient to carry the river and harbor improvements certainly until the next session of Congress. Economy! My friend from Florida [Mr. SPARKMAN] referred to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR]—and I am not sure but he did to myself—as being in favor of extravagant expenditures. While I do not criticize my friend from Florida, who is so seldom here on the floor that he does not know what position we do take, but whatever position we have taken, we take the position now that these river and harbor improvements and maintenance can well wait over until we know what effect will be caused by the European war upon our revenues. [Applause on the Republican side.] It will not hurt anybody except those



who seek to be returned to Congress only upon the basis that they have secured appropriations, and I hope there are none of that kind.

I do not think it wise to do this. If this river and harbor bill is defeated, or the amount appropriated is reduced from \$20,000,000 to \$5,000,000, the Senate may well strike out all of these odious stamp taxes in the war-revenue bill, and if we will keep the expenditure for rivers and harbors down to where they belong at this time that action, in my opinion, will be taken in the Senate. And then when we have the money raised in the ordinary way we will continue the river and harbor improvements throughout the country where they ought to be continued, by proper legislative action, instead of leaving it as a matter of favoritism to the engineers of the Government. [Applause on the Republican side.]

How much time have I remaining, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has seven minutes remaining.

Mr. MANN. I yield that to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD], if he so desires.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a brief statement of my position on this bill. The motion to concur in the Senate amendment will eliminate all new projects which were proposed in the bill by the House. When the bill passed the House it contained an item of \$500,000 for the removal of what is known as Coenties Reef, in the East River. The city of New York is engaged in the construction of a subway system to relieve the congested transportation situation in that city that involves an expenditure of \$300,000,000. One of the tubes to connect the island of Manhattan with Brooklyn is projected to pass through that reef. The officials of the city of New York, joining with the Army engineers, presented to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors the item for the appropriation and authorization for the removal of the reef at this time, because if it be not done at the earliest opportunity it will have to be undertaken after tubes providing for double-track trains have been built under the river through the reef. The cost will be greatly increased, while the danger of doing the work and the possibility of completely damaging, if not ruining, the subway system is recognized by all engineers as very great. I can not bring myself to vote for an appropriation of \$20,000,000 to continue river and harbor improvement work throughout the country if an item of this character, of such vital importance to a community of almost 6,000,000 souls, to a community which has contributed more than 60 per cent of the money expended by the State of New York in the construction of a canal system that has cost \$139,000,000, without any help from the Federal Government, is not to be provided for at this time. Contributing, as it does, so much toward the revenues of the Government, relying so much upon its own resources, whatever provision is made by the Congress for river and harbor improvements at this time, in my judgment, should contain the necessary authority and money to remove Coenties Reef and thus permit the public improvements mentioned, so vital to the welfare and prosperity of the metropolis of the country, to be continued without jeopardizing the safety of the people and increasing the financial burdens that will result. So long as this bill does not provide for that improvement I shall not vote for an appropriation of \$20,000,000. Rather than be a party to authorizing an expenditure of \$20,000,000 for river and harbor improvements without provision for this item so vital to the interests of the city of New York, I shall vote for the amendment, which I understand has been offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY], to appropriate \$5,000,000 to continue only the absolutely essential maintenance work upon existing improvements. [Applause.]

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 13 minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I do not expect to occupy the time of this House for 13 minutes—at least, I hope not—but I do wish to take a very few minutes to reply to some remarks made here this afternoon and also to refer briefly to one or two amendments offered.

The first amendment to which I desire to direct attention is that of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY]. I sympathize very much with the objects and purposes of that amendment, but if we were to adopt it, as I stated this morning, we would in all probability imperil the passage of that measure in the Senate when our action goes back there for action.

I am told that if it goes back there with any amendment attached to it likely to provoke discussion, it will probably be hung up there indefinitely and likely not reach a vote in that

body, which, of course, would be fatal to the proposed legislation.

Then, there is another objection to the proposed amendment, but before I go further I want to say that the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House inserted a provision, not just of that nature but which would have met the same ends sought to be gained by the amendment, but it was stricken out in the Senate and went along with other discarded items at that end of the Capitol. That provision, like this, would have extended the jurisdiction of the Mississippi River Commission up to Rock Island, Ill. But work on the channel of the river between the mouth of the Missouri and Rock Island is now being prosecuted under a project which is in charge of the engineers and over which the Mississippi River Commission has no jurisdiction. In other words, it is a project calling for open-channel and regulation works as contradistinguished from that of levee building. This project was adopted some years ago, and appropriations have been made for it in each bill since its adoption. This bill as it left the House carried a large appropriation for the work, so that if the amendment offered were to be adopted it would, I fear, interfere materially with work under this project.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Florida yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me finish this statement, and I will be glad to do so.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when we went to deal with the feature of levee building above the mouth of the Ohio River we inserted a separate provision from that, in which an appropriation to be expended on the lower part of the river was made, simply providing that any funds appropriated in the bill for improving the Mississippi River between Head of Passes and the mouth of the Ohio River, and which may be allotted to levees, may be expended, under the direction of the Secretary of War, in accordance with the plans, specifications, and recommendations of the Mississippi River Commission, as approved by the Chief of Engineers, for levees upon any part of said river between Head of Passes and Rock Island, Ill., in such manner as, in their opinion, shall best improve navigation and promote the interests of commerce at all stages of the river.

It will be observed that the Mississippi River Commission under the preceding paragraph was given a sum of money to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War, in accordance with plans, specifications, and recommendations of the Mississippi River Commission as approved by the Chief of Engineers, for the general improvement of the river, for the building of levees, and so forth, thus clothing the Mississippi River Commission with the power not only to build levees but to do construction work in the river. Now, to adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois would give the Mississippi River Commission like jurisdiction over the channel above the mouth of the Ohio and at least as far up as Rock Island, Ill., thus taking from the engineers the work they are now doing there; besides, it might have the effect of very seriously interfering with, if it did not make it impossible to do, the work in the river between Rock Island and St. Paul.

That is to say, we provided that the jurisdiction of the Mississippi River Commission should be extended to Rock Island, Ill., and that any money that was appropriated for the purpose of levee building in the interest, of course, of navigation should be expended by the Mississippi River Commission. Now, to adopt this particular amendment would be going beyond that provision and would take that work from the engineers, causing, no doubt, a great deal of confusion. It would take away from them the work that they are doing and would turn that open-channel work over to the Mississippi River Commission—something that we have not as yet contemplated, and something for which there is no recommendation whatever by the engineers.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I will.

Mr. RAINEY. Is it not true, however, that the effect of my amendment, if adopted, would leave it optional with the Mississippi River Commission as to whether they would expend any money on the upper river or not?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct.

Mr. RAINEY. Then, one question further. If that is true, the adoption of this amendment would not interfere with any project south of the mouth of the Ohio River. If the Mississippi River Commission wanted to spend all of this money south of the mouth of the Ohio River, they could still do it?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; but it would turn over to the commission all the open-channel and other work, which was not



contemplated, as the purpose was to only permit them to do levee building in the interest of navigation.

Mr. RAINEY. Is not my amendment in line with the original act creating the Mississippi River Commission, which gave them jurisdiction as far north as the headwaters of the river?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; that is probably true, but since then by several acts of Congress that jurisdiction of the commission has been cut down from time to time until now it only extends upstream to the mouth of the Ohio River.

Mr. RAINEY. If my amendment should be defeated, what is going to become of this \$190,000 of unexpended balance which the Mississippi River Commission has already allotted to the levees on the upper river?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I was coming to that. I am not sure, I will say, Mr. Speaker, but that the Mississippi River Commission already has jurisdiction up to Rock Island. That is a legal question depending upon the construction of legislation had regarding that matter in the bill of 1913.

Mr. RAINEY. This bill now limits all expenditures to the lower river.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That depends, as I said, upon what construction is placed upon the 1913 act. It may not have been necessary, but out of abundance of caution we inserted the provision in the way I stated, but the language contained in the amendment offered by the gentleman would, I fear, repeal the project upon which we are now doing work in the upper Mississippi River, at least as far up as Rock Island.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a word in regard to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York relating to Coenties Reef. That is a very important work, but, so far as navigation is concerned, is no more urgent than many others cut out by the Senate amendment; but still it is important that the reef be removed before the city of New York runs the tunnel through it, because if the tunnel is constructed first, the blasting that would be necessary later in order to remove the reef might destroy the tunnel, as dynamite used in blasting might destroy the tunnel; so that the Committee on Rivers and Harbors thought it wise to insert and did insert a provision in the bill appropriating \$500,000 for the removal of this reef; but in the Senate it was, along with many other good provisions, eliminated; and while I sympathize very much with the city of New York, and am sorry the provision was stricken out, as it was a very meritorious one, I can not consent to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York, for if we adopt that amendment we will be doing something for that project that we are not doing for any other place; we will be making an exception that we ought not to make, unless we are prepared to open up the bill all along the line. So, very reluctantly, I am compelled to oppose the amendment and for reasons just given to express the hope that it will not be adopted.

Now, just a word in regard to the remarks made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] as to the appropriations that have been made during recent years for river and harbor improvement. For instance, the gentleman spoke of the bill of 1899 as carrying, I think, fifteen or sixteen million dollars, while, as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, that bill carried about \$37,000,000.

Again, the gentleman spoke of quite a number of Congresses during which there were no appropriations at all made for rivers and harbors. He passed over in silence the year 1901, when one among the largest bills for rivers and harbors ever framed was passed by this body, with the gentleman, I presume, voting for it, as he usually votes for those measures, and very properly, too. But it went to the Senate, and there it was talked to death by a distinguished Senator who obtained the floor with the intention of killing it. This Senator talked until the 4th of March had rolled around, and the bill died on the calendar. Now, a word—

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, did I understand the gentleman to say that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] was in error and that instead of a \$16,000,000 appropriation there was \$38,000,000?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Thirty-seven million dollars.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman say—

Mr. SPARKMAN. Will the gentleman yield me some time if I answer his question?

Mr. MANN. I will. How much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER. Two minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I will yield to the gentleman, anyway, and without any condition.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman say that the river and harbor bill of 1899 appropriated \$37,000,000?

Mr. SPARKMAN. No; I did not say that. I said it carried that amount; but the gentleman did not call attention to the large authorization carried in that bill which is equivalent to a cash appropriation, as it comes in succeeding sundry civil bills.

Mr. MANN. That is true; I did not. But it was not appropriated at that time, nor for a considerable time after that.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is a very common way gentlemen sometimes have—I will not say the gentleman from Illinois—of getting around or distracting attention from such large appropriations regarded by some as extravagant. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MANN. I did not hear what the gentleman said.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Now, a few words with reference to the amount appropriated by the Democrats here for rivers and harbors since they have had control of this body—the gentleman spoke of some very large amount as having been appropriated since then, I have forgotten just what it was, but it was something enormous—much larger than the records will show it to have been.

I want to say that the only bills that have been passed by Congress since the Democrats have assumed control were those of 1912 and 1913, the aggregate of which footed up about \$80,000,000; but from 1896 down to 1911, inclusive, the Congress during all these years being under the control of the Republican Party, appropriated—very properly, in my judgment—the large sum of about \$400,000,000, while during the years that the Democrats have had the House—now nearly four—we have only appropriated \$80,000,000, and in doing this we have kept within the recommendations of the engineers. In other words, the engineers have recommended every project we have adopted in this House and each sum we have appropriated for the various projects carried in each bill.

Mr. DONOVAN. I should like to ask the gentleman if he said the amount was \$400,000,000 during the years that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] said it was only \$16,000,000?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not recall what the gentleman from Illinois said.

Mr. DONOVAN. Do we understand the chairman of the committee to say that \$400,000,000 was spent from 1898 to 1911, inclusive, when the gentleman from Illinois wanted us to believe that it was practically only \$16,000,000?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think the gentleman from Connecticut is in error as to the \$16,000,000.

Mr. DONOVAN. But you say \$400,000,000 is correct?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes. Now, Mr. Speaker, just a word with reference to the amount that is now available or was available on June 30 last. Remarks have been made which would indicate that gentlemen are laboring under an erroneous impression as to that matter, and I should like to have the special attention of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] while I am on that subject. He repeated a remark which has been made several times, that the available balance on that date was \$45,338,000, or something like that. I want to say that he has perhaps been led into error by not noticing closely the first column of the figures furnished by the War Department in Senate Document 550. The first column of this document refers to balances unexpended and to available balances. The report in the last column shows the available balance to be only \$22,000,000 instead of \$45,000,000, and that out of that should come \$4,350,000, which pertains to works of improvement held up pending compliance with terms of cooperation on the part of local interests, and which will not be expended until those conditions have been complied with.

Now, this amount should be deducted, as it is not available for immediate use, and may not be for months and years. Deducting this would leave the apparent balance at \$18,288,411, but I am told at the War Department that this apparent is not the actual available balance applicable to works contained in the rivers and harbors bill as it left the House, and that only about \$9,000,000—I speak in round figures—is really available for the projects covered by the House bill, so that instead of having \$45,000,000 available, as the gentlemen have said, we only have about \$9,000,000. Now, I do not suppose that any gentleman intended to mislead, but that he only was mistaken by reason of not having noted carefully the difference between "balances unexpended" and "balances available," which are often quite different things.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not like to refer to politics or political parties when considering a river and harbor bill, which is a business proposition and should not be treated from a partisan standpoint. Since I first entered Congress to the present time no river and harbor bill, so far as I know, has ever been framed or considered upon political lines, and I regret to see an ap-

parent effort here to-day to inject politics into our deliberations. But since reference has been made to the appropriations made by Congress while last under the control of the Republican Party, and a comparison sought to be made between appropriations during that period and those made since Congress passed into the control of the Democratic Party, I will here insert in my remarks the following statement, showing the amounts carried in the various river and harbor bills since and including that of 1896:

June 3, 1896	.....	\$76,195,570.37
Mar. 3, 1899	.....	36,730,166.07
June 13, 1902	.....	65,107,602.00
Mar. 3, 1905	.....	35,366,533.04
Mar. 2, 1907	.....	86,872,432.00
Mar. 3, 1909	.....	10,071,625.00
June 25, 1910	.....	51,945,843.50
Feb. 27, 1911	.....	36,956,987.00
July 25, 1912	.....	33,259,370.50
Mar. 4, 1913	.....	47,868,894.00
Total	.....	480,375,023.48

I do not wish it to be understood that I am finding fault with the appropriations. They were all needed, while the most of them have been expended, and that, too, upon worthy projects. But reference to them will enable anyone to see that both parties have been liberal—none too liberal, let me say—toward river and harbor improvement during the past two decades.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman will yield, I stated all those facts.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to offer an amendment.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. The amendment had to be offered during the debate, as I understood it.

The SPEAKER. The Chair's recollection of the agreement is that anybody who made a speech could offer an amendment.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. While he had the floor.

Mr. MANN. I yielded to the gentleman the time which I had.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes; but he did not offer the amendment when he had the floor.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois has two minutes yet remaining.

Mr. MANN. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD].

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Oh, well, if the gentleman does that—

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 6, line 16, after the word "works," insert "including not to exceed \$500,000 for improving East River and Hell Gate, N. Y., in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 108, Sixty-third Congress, first session."

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, this amendment if adopted would enable the Army Engineers to commence the work of removing Coenties Reef, to which I have already referred, through which one of the tubes of the \$300,000,000 subway system in the city of New York is to be constructed. It seems to me that the House, if it intends to appropriate \$20,000,000 for river and harbor work, considering the gravity of the situation and the tremendous importance of the item to the city of New York, taken into consideration with the fact that that city has contributed from 60 to 70 per cent of the \$139,000,000 expended by the State of New York for the construction of a 1,000-ton barge canal without appealing to the Federal Government for aid, ought to adopt this amendment. The amendment does not increase the proposed expenditure of \$20,000,000, but if adopted it would authorize the work and enable preparations to be completed and the work begun. Otherwise if the tube is completed through the reef before the necessary removal is done and afterwards the work is authorized, as it soon must be, the cost, in the opinion of the best engineers, will be enormously increased, while the safety of the tubes will be impaired. Such a situation has never existed elsewhere in the country. If this item affected some improvement desirable, important, even essential to the development of the port of New York, special effort would not be made at this time to have it included in the pending bill. But a situation unique in our history is present. A subway system unrivaled in all time has been projected, planned, authorized, and financed. Contracts have been let to successful bidders, and an improvement vitally affecting 6,000,000 people and to cost \$300,000,000 has been begun. The removal of the proposed portion of this reef is imperative at this time. Refusal to act can not be justified, and the House should adopt the amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the first amendment that I offered.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, can we have that amendment reported?

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 66, line 11, after the word "of," strike out "\$20,000,000" and insert "\$5,000,000."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington withdraws that amendment, and the Clerk will report the second amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute for the Senate amendment:

"That the sum of \$5,000,000 be, and the same hereby is, appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be immediately available and to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers, for the preservation and maintenance of existing river and harbor works: *Provided*, That allotments for maintenance from the amount hereby appropriated shall be made by the Secretary of War upon the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers: *Provided further*, That allotments for the maintenance of the Mississippi River from the Head of Passes to the mouth of the Ohio River shall be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War in accordance with the plans, specifications, and recommendations of the Mississippi River Commission as approved by the Chief of Engineers: *And provided further*, That at the beginning of the next session of Congress a special report shall be made to Congress by the Secretary of War showing the amount allotted under this appropriation to each work of maintenance."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, several amendments were offered to perfect the text of the Senate amendment, and those would come first before the vote on the substitute. This amendment of the gentleman from Washington is a substitute, and the other amendment would come first and the substitute next.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that the gentleman's substitute was not read during the debate, and the agreement this morning was that all amendments should be offered during general debate.

Mr. MANN. I think the gentleman from Florida must have been asleep.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. It was read.

The SPEAKER. The suggestion of the gentleman from Illinois as to the manner in which these votes shall be taken is correct. The substitute will be waived for the time being, and then the Chair will pass upon the points of order. The Clerk will report the first amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend. page 66, line 16, by striking out the word "existing."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PARKER:

"Page 67, line 7, after the word 'improvement,' insert 'And provided further, That of the \$20,000,000 herein appropriated \$750,000 shall be applied to the improvement of the Hudson River by continuing the construction of the lock and dam at Troy, N. Y.'"

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. RAINEY:

"Amend by striking out, in lines 24 and 25 on page 66, the words 'the mouth of the Ohio River' and insert in lieu thereof 'Rock Island, Ill.'"

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. RAINEY) there were—ayes 46, noes 123.

So the amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. FITZGERALD:

"Page 66, line 16, after the word 'works,' insert 'including not to exceed \$500,000 for improving the East River and Hell Gate, N. Y., in accordance with the report submitted in House Document No. 108, Sixty-third Congress, first session.'"

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. FITZGERALD) there were—ayes 61, noes 136.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York makes the point of order that there is no quorum present, and the Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and thirty-seven Members present—a quorum.

So the amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will now report the second Humphrey substitute.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, that has been already reported.

The SPEAKER. Very well. What point of order was it that the gentleman from Florida desired to make against that?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I do not care to make the point of order against the substitute.



The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 130, nays 171, answered "present" 0, not voting 130, as follows:

## YEAS—130.

Adair	Fitzgerald	Kennedy, Iowa	Plumley
Anderson	Fitzhugh	Kennedy, R. I.	Post
Anthony	Fordney	Kinkaid, Nebr.	Prouty
Ashbrook	Foster	Kreider	Reilly, Wis.
Avis	Frear	La Follette	Roberts, Mass.
Bailey	Gallagher	Langham	Roberts, Nev.
Barton	Gallivan	Langley	Rogers
Borchers	Gard	Lenroot	Saunders
Brown, W. Va.	Gardner	Lobeck	Scott
Browne, Wis.	Gillett	McAndrews	Seldomridge
Bulkley	Goeke	McKenzie	Sells
Burke, S. Dak.	Good	McLaughlin	Shreve
Callaway	Gorman	MacDonald	Sloan
Campbell	Gray	Madden	Smith, J. M. C.
Carew	Green, Iowa	Maguire, Nebr.	Smith, Minn.
Cary	Greene, Mass.	Manahan	Smith, Tex.
Clancy	Greene, Vt.	Mann	Stafford
Connelly, Kans.	Griest	Mapes	Stephens, Miss.
Cooper	Hamilton, Mich.	Metz	Stephens, Tex.
Cramton	Hayes	Miller	Stevens, Minn.
Crosser	Helgesen	Mondell	Stone
Ianforth	Helm	Morgan, Okla.	Talcott, N. Y.
Davis	Helvering	Morrison	Taylor, Colo.
Decker	Hinds	Moss, Ind.	Thompson, Okla.
Deltrick	Hinebaugh	Norton	Thomson, Ill.
Dillon	Howard	O'Hair	Towner
Doolittle	Hullings	O'Leary	Treadway
Drukker	Humphrey, Wash.	Pace, N. C.	Volstead
Dunn	Johnson, Utah	Palge, Mass.	Walters
Esch	Johnson, Wash.	Patten, N. Y.	Webb
Evans	Keating	Patton, Pa.	Whitacre
Fairchild	Kelley, Mich.	Payne	
Fess	Kelly, Pa.	Flatt	

## NAYS—171.

Abercrombie	Difenderfer	Igoe	Rucker
Adamson	Dixon	Jacoway	Russell
Alken	Donohoe	Johnson, Ky.	Scully
Alexander	Donovan	Johnson, S. C.	Shackelford
Allen	Doremus	Kettner	Sherley
Aswell	Dupré	Key, Ohio	Sherwood
Baker	Eagan	Kirkpatrick	Sims
Baltz	Eagle	Kitchin	Sinnott
Barchfeld	Edmonds	Lafferty	Slayden
Barkley	Falconer	Lazaro	Small
Barnhart	Fergusson	Lee, Ga.	Smith, Idaho
Bathrick	Ferris	Lee, Pa.	Sparkman
Beakes	Fields	Leshner	Stanley
Beall, Tex.	Finley	Lieb	Stephens, Cal.
Bell, Ga.	Flood, Va.	Logue	Stout
Blackmon	Floyd, Ark.	Loneragan	Sutherland
Booher	Fowler	McCoy	Switzer
Borland	Garner	McGillcuddy	Taggart
Bowdler	Garrett, Tenn.	McKellar	Tavener
Brockson	Garrett, Tex.	Mahan	Taylor, Ala.
Brodbeck	Gerry	Mitchell	Taylor, Ark.
Broussard	Gill	Moon	Temple
Brumbaugh	Gilmore	Moore	Ten Eyck
Bryan	Glass	Morgan, La.	Thacher
Buchanan, Tex.	Goodwin, Ark.	Moss, W. Va.	Thomas
Burgess	Gordon	Mulkey	Townsend
Burnett	Goulden	Murray, Mass.	Tribble
Butler	Graham, Ill.	Murray, Okla.	Tuttle
Byrns, Tenn.	Gudger	Neely, W. Va.	Underhill
Caraway	Hamlin	Nolan, J. I.	Underwood
Carter	Hardwick	Oldfield	Vare
Casey	Hardy	Padgett	Vaughan
Church	Harrison	Park	Vollmer
Clark, Fla.	Hart	Parker	Walker
Cline	Hawley	Peterson	Watson
Collier	Hayden	Phelan	Weaver
Cox	Heflin	Pou	Whaley
Crisp	Henry	Quin	White
Cullop	Hill	Ralney	Williams
Curry	Holland	Raker	Wilson, Fla.
Dent	Houston	Reilly, Conn.	Wingo
Dickinson	Hughes, Ga.	Rouse	Young, Tex.
Dies	Hull	Rubey	

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—0.

## NOT VOTING—130.

Ainey	Chandler, N. Y.	George	Jones
Ansberry	Claypool	Gittins	Kahn
Austin	Coady	Godwin, N. C.	Keister
Bartholdt	Connolly, Iowa	Goldfogle	Kennedy, Conn.
Bartlett	Conry	Graham, Pa.	Kent
Bell, Cal.	Copley	Gregg	Kless, Pa.
Britten	Covington	Griffin	Kindel
Brown, N. Y.	Dale	Guernsey	Kinkaid, N. J.
Browning	Davenport	Hamill	Knowland, J. R.
Bruckner	Dershem	Hamilton, N. Y.	Konop
Buchanan, Ill.	Dooling	Hammond	Korby
Burke, Pa.	Doughton	Harr's	L'Engle
Burke, Wis.	Driscoll	Haugen	Lever
Byrnes, S. C.	Edwards	Hay	Levy
Calder	Elder	Hensley	Lewis, Md.
Candler, Miss.	Estopinal	Hobson	Lewis, Pa.
Cantor	Faison	Howell	Lindbergh
Cantrill	Farr	Hoxworth	Lindquist
Carlin	Francis	Hughes, W. Va.	Linthicum
Carr	French	Humphreys, Miss.	Lloyd

Left	Oglesby	Sabath	Taylor, N. Y.
McClellan	O'Shaunessy	Sisson	Wallin
McGuire, Okla.	Palmer	Slomp	Walsh
Maher	Peters	Smith, Md.	Watkins
Martin	Porter	Smith, N. Y.	Willis
Merritt	Powers	Smith, Saml. W.	Wilson, N. Y.
Montague	Ragsdale	Stedman	Winslow
Morin	Rauch	Steenerson	Witherspoon
Mott	Rayburn	Stephens, Nebr.	Woodruff
Murdock	Reed	Stevens, N. H.	Woods
Neeley, Kans.	Riordan	Stringer	Young, N. Dak.
Nelson	Rothermel	Summers	
O'Brien	Rupley	Talbott, Md.	

So the Humphrey substitute was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi (against substitute) with Mr. WINSLOW (for).

For to-day:

Mr. HAY with Mr. KAHN.

Until further notice:

Mr. GREGG with Mr. AUSTIN.

Mr. WATKINS with Mr. WILLIS.

Mr. SUMNERS with Mr. BROWNING.

Mr. UNDERHILL with Mr. CALDER.

Mr. FRANCIS with Mr. BELL of California.

Mr. BARTLETT with Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania.

Mr. KONOP with Mr. LEWIS of Pennsylvania.

Mr. HENSLEY with Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Iowa with Mr. POWERS.

Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland with Mr. MERRITT.

Mr. PALMER with Mr. MARTIN.

Mr. DERSHEM with Mr. KISS of Pennsylvania.

Mr. ANSBERRY with Mr. AINEY.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois with Mr. BARTHOLDT.

Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin with Mr. BRITTEN.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina with Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi with Mr. CHANDLER of New York.

Mr. CANTOR with Mr. COPLEY.

Mr. CANTRILL with Mr. FARR.

Mr. CARR with Mr. GUERNSEY.

Mr. DAVENPORT with Mr. HAMILTON of New York.

Mr. DOUGHTON with Mr. HAUGEN.

Mr. STEDMAN with Mr. HOWELL.

Mr. EDWARDS with Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia.

Mr. ESTOPINAL with Mr. KEISTER.

Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina with Mr. LINDQUIST.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE with Mr. MCGUIRE of Oklahoma.

Mr. KINKADE of New Jersey with Mr. MORIN.

Mr. LEVER with Mr. MOTT.

Mr. LEVY with Mr. PETERS.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland with Mr. PORTER.

Mr. LINTHICUM with Mr. SLEMP.

Mr. MCCLELLAN with Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH.

Mr. MONTAGUE with Mr. STEENERSON.

Mr. NEELEY of Kansas with Mr. WALLIN.

Mr. RAGSDALE with Mr. WOODRUFF.

Mr. REED with Mr. WOODS.

Mr. SABATH with Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on concurring in the Senate amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The question was taken, and the Senate amendment in the nature of a substitute was concurred in.

On motion of Mr. SPARKMAN, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the Senate amendment was concurred in was laid on the table.

## ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bill of the following title:

S. 3550. An act ratifying the establishment of the boundary line between the States of Connecticut and Massachusetts.

## ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 51 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, September 30, 1914, at 12 o'clock noon.

## PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MACDONALD: A bill (H. R. 19015) to provide for the establishment of a national employment bureau in the Department of Labor; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. RUPLEY: A bill (H. R. 19016) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Lykens, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MACDONALD: A bill (H. R. 19017) to provide for the establishment of a national employment bureau in the Post Office Department; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas: A bill (H. R. 19018) to enlarge the powers of Federal reserve banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CARTER (by request): A bill (H. R. 19036) to amend an act entitled "An act granting to Savanna Coal Co. right to acquire additional acreage to its existing coal lease in the Choctaw Nation, Pittsburg County, Okla., and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1910; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SHERWOOD: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 357) to correct certain errors in H. R. 12045, H. R. 12914, H. R. 13542, H. R. 14234, H. R. 14738, H. R. 15692, and H. R. 16294; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 358) authorizing the printing of 200,000 copies of Uncle Sam's Cook Book; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. MANN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 359) to correct a clerical error in the act entitled "An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war," approved July 21, 1914, Private Act No. 86, Sixty-third Congress; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NORTON: Resolution (H. Res. 632) requesting certain information of the Secretary of the Treasury; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 19019) granting a pension to Anna R. Wright; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 19020) granting an increase of pension to Daniel W. Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 19021) granting an increase of pension to Charles S. Elliott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19022) granting a pension to Augusta Neff; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 19023) granting an increase of pension to John C. Hennon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DONOVAN: A bill (H. R. 19024) granting an increase of pension to Ella A. Buckley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19025) granting an increase of pension to Gertrude E. Cornell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19026) granting an increase of pension to Robert L. Keith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19027) granting a pension to Bridget Goffney; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 19028) granting a pension to William C. Fowler; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LANGHAM: A bill (H. R. 19029) granting an increase of pension to George Adams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LIEB: A bill (H. R. 19030) granting an increase of pension to John Collignon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19031) granting an increase of pension to John C. Gorman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19032) granting an increase of pension to James Royer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCLELLAN: A bill (H. R. 19033) granting an increase of pension to Orrin Maybe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 19034) granting an increase of pension to John Clinkenbeard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of New York: A bill (H. R. 19035) granting an increase of pension to George C. Foote; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ALLEN: A bill (H. R. 19037) granting an increase of pension to Nina B. Pugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of Theodore A. Woodruff, Parker, Ariz., relative to emergency mining legislation; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petitions of the churches at Fredericksburg, Creston, and Wooster, Ohio, in favor of national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BAILEY: Petitions of First National Bank, Altoona, Pa., and First National Bank, Patten, Pa., against taxing banks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of George H. Russell, Milwaukee, Wis., favoring placing tax on all newspapers and magazines issued; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Joseph Schlitz Brewing Co., Milwaukee, Wis., protesting against special tax on liquors; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOSTER: Petition of Southern Illinois Methodist Conference, protesting against increasing the tax on beer and wine; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of Men's Temple Class, Boston, Mass., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GLASS: Petition of business men of Bedford City, Salem, Roanoke, East Radford, all in the State of Virginia, favoring House bill 5308, to tax mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANGHAM: Petition of Pennsylvania State Association of Letter Carriers, Harrisburg, Pa., favoring passage of the McGillicuddy compensation bill for letter carriers when sick; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LOBECK: Petition of National Association of Vicksburg Veterans, favoring appropriation for semicentennial celebration at Vicksburg Military Park; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Nebraska, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition of the Socialist Party of Nebraska, favoring strict neutrality of the United States Government during European war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska: Petition of business men of Brock, Nebr., favoring passage of H. R. 5308, relative to taxing mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAKER: Memorial of San Francisco and Stockton (Cal.) Clearing House Association, protesting against special tax on banking houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: Memorial of Minnesota Veteran Cavalry Association, protesting against any change in the American flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALCOTT of New York: Memorial of the Socialist Party, Utica (N. Y.) Local Organization, favoring maintaining strict neutrality by the Government in regard to European war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of New Orleans Association of Commerce, relative to revival of American merchant marine; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of the National Association of Vicksburg Veterans, favoring appropriation by Congress for reunion of veterans at Vicksburg, Miss.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. THACHER: Petition of citizens of Hingham and Sandwich, Mass., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

#### SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, September 30, 1914.

(Legislative day of Monday, September 28, 1914).

The Senate reassembled at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

#### THE OIL INDUSTRY.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Interstate Commerce Commission acknowledging the receipt of the resolution of the 28th instant, in relation to an investigation of the conditions prevailing and that have prevailed in the States of New York, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and Ohio, or elsewhere, affecting the production, transportation, and marketing of crude petroleum, etc., which was ordered to lie on the table.